

लाल बहादुर शास्त्री राष्ट्रीय प्रशासन अकादमी

L.B.S. National Academy of Administration

मसूरी
MUSSOORIE

पुस्तकालय
LIBRARY

अवाप्ति संख्या

Accession No.

101002

~~101002~~

वर्ग संख्या

Class No.

215.25

पुस्तक संख्या

Book No.

Lam

GL 215.25
LAM



101002
LBSNAA

RELIGION IN A SPACE AGE

RELIGION IN A SPACE AGE

by

JOHN LAMBLEY



GEORGE RONALD
London

© John Lambley 1960

Printed by BARNICOTTS LIMITED
at THE WESSEX PRESS, TAUNTON

CONTENTS

The Search

1. Our Problem	9
2. Our Starting Point	14
3. Knowledge	19

What Science and Reason Can Neither Prove Nor Disprove

4. The Existence of a First Cause	27
---	----

Why We Cannot Accept Existing Beliefs

5. Faith	35
6. Mysticism	39
7. Immortality	44
8. Christianity	48

Creation as Seen by a Non-Specialist

9. Evolution the Design of the First Cause	59
10. The Individual	68
11. The Species	75
12. Human Varieties	80
13. Inequality	89
14. The Will to Power	93
15. The Unity of Creation	98
16. Good and Evil	103
17. Rival "Goods"	110
18. Our "Beliefs" and What They Imply	116

THE SEARCH

Chapter 1. OUR PROBLEM

Search for meaning of existence—Religion and the advance of science—What lies behind phenomena?—Our limitations—Specialized knowledge—How to find fundamental laws?

Chapter 2. OUR STARTING POINT

The foundation on which we reason—Scientific reality—Design part of reality—Sensory perceptions not illusions—Mind's power to add to sensory perceptions—Freewill and natural laws—Limitations of freewill—Freewill and morality—Freewill a necessity for survival.

Chapter 3. KNOWLEDGE

No reasoning without facts—Scientific facts—The limitations of reason—"Awareness" from extra-sensory perception—Revelation—The necessity of using both sensory and extra-sensory knowledge.

CHAPTER I

OUR PROBLEM

THE search for the meaning of existence never ends. For thousands of years philosophers have been writing learned treatises on it; religious bodies have been advancing their ideas about it, but as yet no common agreement has been reached.

Religion has solved the problem for the majority. Born in a Christian country they accept Christianity as truth; born Romans they would have been the followers of some contemporary god or goddess. They uncritically accept the beliefs of the time and place to which they belong. Their convictions, or rather faiths, are due to the accident of birth. It is as well that this is so. The average man, in his struggle for existence, has neither the time, nor the ability to work matters out for himself; and in the trials and turmoils of this world the belief in something greater than one's self is a fundamental necessity.

But in this modern age there are many who cannot accept existing beliefs. The advance of science, *especially the theory of evolution*, has proved many of these beliefs to be wrong, and this has thrown a doubt on the whole. These doubters should not be condemned. They are more honest intellectually than those of the faithful who deliberately blind themselves to anything that challenges their traditional beliefs. In the confusion created by the many

conflicting ideas now prevalent, many of them are genuinely seeking the truth.

But where shall we find the truth about the reality behind phenomena? In religion, which is so dogmatically sure of itself but cannot prove by reason what it asserts? Or in science, which can demonstrate to us how the universe is made, but not what purpose it serves? Or is truth something different for each of us? Is what we believe to be true the outcome of our own hopes and fears, or is reality something which is indifferent to human welfare? We always associate truth with beauty and goodness. We take it for granted that whatever reality is, it is something which favours humanity. But is this not wishful thinking? Can we be sure that the universe exists solely for the benefit of the human race? If we are to know truth these questions need answering.

The search for truth is not to be undertaken lightly. Peace of mind comes only to those who "believe"; who have that certainty which only a religious faith can give. Whether this faith is truth or not does not matter. Each faith gives its own explanation of reality which the true believer finds spiritually satisfying, however much it may differ from that of other faiths. If the doubter cannot accept a faith, and would seek truth for himself, then he must be prepared for many dark and despairing moments.

Before trying to find out the truth about anything we have to realize our own limitations. There are many things which we can never know. Our knowledge of psychical and physical phenomena is continually expanding, but it is expanding into infinity, and, as infinity has no limits, it follows that we can never know ultimate causes. Even if we assume that knowledge is finite, that

we can follow the horizon in our pursuit of it until we come back to our starting point, and that all knowledge is contained in a closed sphere, we still should not know what brought the sphere into being.

Everything we know, or can know, whether it be in the realm of science or theology has some bearing on the meaning of life, and the more knowledge we can use in our search for truth the better. The trouble is that not only can we never know all that is relevant to the problem of existence, but also that what is already known is still too much for any one man to assimilate. Finding the truth is an impossible task if it means studying all the beliefs that exist and have existed, comparing them, and then drawing fresh conclusions. Life is too short. From the multitude of facts we now have about the universe we have to pick and choose those which we believe to throw the clearest light on our problem, and ignore the rest. It follows that any conclusion we arrive at has to be based on something less than the total evidence available.

Picking and choosing what we believe to be relevant means that our judgments will be coloured by our own personalities. However much we try to be objective, our personal backgrounds, hopes, fears and prejudices will inevitably count.

The growth of modern knowledge has, of necessity, led to specialization, and this concentration by different individuals on different subjects is liable to lead us further from the truth than ever. The theologian sees reality as spirit; the scientists as matter. Immersed as they are in their own separate lines of inquiry, neither seem to be able to visualize a Reality that may be both spirit and matter. Gone are the days when we had natural philosophers who could say in good faith that they "knew it

all," who could—with confidence—tell us that the earth was flat, and at the same time that God was in his high heaven. To-day, knowledge is divided into too many watertight compartments. Specialization is apt to give us a distorted, one-sided view of reality. We see the trees, but not the wood.

As the specialists cannot agree among themselves as to what lies behind phenomena, it seems that we might do better by trying to see things as a whole, that is by trying to see both from the viewpoint of the theologian and the scientist. Our perceptions of some aspects of reality may be less keen than those of the specialist, but if our reasoning is correct, we should get a better, if not quite so sharp, an overall picture.

It is for this reason that the writer, who is neither theologian nor scientist, and who has no more qualifications to give weight to his opinion than any other man in the street, finds his justification for trying to sort matters out for himself. He writes as a doubter, and for the doubters. The views expressed are his own, but he has reason to believe that they are similar to those of many others who have lost "faith."

However much the faithful may disagree with us, we realize that ultimate truth will never be known. We can approach it, but only in so far as our knowledge of physical and psychical phenomena will allow us. We make no claim to prophetic vision which would enable us to see over the horizon.

Yet in spite of this, we need to know something of the meaning of existence. Life itself depends not only on natural, but on man-made laws and codes of conduct, and these cannot be made without knowing what is the right or wrong action to take in any given circumstances,

We need a guiding principle now, not in the remote future when human understanding will be greater. It is better to form a moral code, however crude, than to live in a blank world of disbelief. The totem pole is better than nothing.

We realize that we cannot be dogmatic. There is so little permanent knowledge on which to base our conception of reality. The ever-increasing number of facts that science is giving us about the universe is continually making us alter our standpoint, to the detriment of our moral and mental stability.

What we do need, if at all possible, is a simple explanation, in non-philosophical language, of those fundamental laws (if there are any) which govern our existence; laws which are constant, and not affected by scientific discoveries. Discovery of these laws will not enable us to know the unknowable, but adherence to them should keep us on the path to truth; should keep us in harmony with whatever purpose there may be behind existence, and help us to regain that peace of mind which so many of us have lost.

To find these laws, and to deduce from them the nature of the cause behind phenomena, is what we, in all humility, have set ourselves to do. Doubting the validity of much that we have been taught we, the doubters, seek our own "salvation."

CHAPTER 2

OUR STARTING POINT

WE start our philosophical quest from the following "beliefs."

1. That the universe is not an illusion
2. That man is a thinking being capable of forming reasoned judgments
3. That man is not the sport of circumstance, but has a certain amount of freewill.

As these beliefs are the foundation on which we base our reasoning we need to justify them before we go on. If we cannot, then our argument is "unreal."

When we examine a piece of wood, our senses report it to us as a brown, hard object. But science goes on to tell us that our piece of wood is made up of atoms, which themselves are nothing more than particles of positive and negative electricity. From the point of view of pure science the "reality" of our brown, hard object is not a piece of wood, but energy. If we accept this view of reality it follows that since electrical energy is something we cannot see, and is certainly not hard to the touch, what our senses have told us about our piece of wood is false. What we know as a brown, hard object, must be an illusion.

But we do not believe that this is the whole story. All atoms are not alike. Some of them have more particles of negative electricity than others. They may be all

made of the same basic stuff but they differ in the arrangement of their particles. They differ in "design." Why this should be so is beyond the scope of science. Design is non-material, and therefore cannot be weighed or measured.

Different atoms, combining in countless different ways, make up the matter of which the universe is composed. The ingredients of this matter are so arranged that the matter itself has become perceptible to our senses. It has become something totally different in kind to the basic stuff of which it is made. To us "reality" is something more than energy. It is energy plus design, and it is design which turns particles of positive and negative electricity into a brown, hard piece of wood.

If the universe is not an illusion then neither is the mind which meditates upon it. The seat of the mind is in the brain and although the brain itself is matter, the mind cannot be said to exist in any material sense. Before it can function it needs to be aware of some aspect of physical, or psychical phenomena. As these phenomena are "real," we have no reason to think that what the mind perceives is false.

The mind, however, is not a perfect instrument. The impressions it receives from phenomena are very often distorted. We have to look, and look again, before we get many of them in a true perspective. But, in spite of this, we have to rely on the mind. It is the only medium we have for interpreting phenomena. Even the impressions we get from psychical sources have to be filtered through the mind before we can accept them.

Although the mind takes impressions of phenomena through the senses (and by other means which we shall discuss later) it is something more than a mirror. It is

capable of "reasoning" about these impressions which gives it the power to foretell, with a certain degree of certainty, what will happen when one phenomenon affects another. This power to juggle with sense impressions, and to put two and two together, is one of man's greatest assets. It has enabled him to alter natural conditions to suit himself. We can see the effects of the non-material mind on matter itself. We all know of the alterations to the earth's surface brought about by deliberate human activity, and there cannot have been deliberate human activity without prior thought.

Until man develops some mode of perception other than that of his present limited senses, what the mind is will never be known. It does not occupy space, and therefore cannot be analysed. The human mind is one of the great mysteries of life.

It may be granted that man is a reasoning being and that what he perceives of the universe is real, but this does not prove that he is a free agent. As he is a part of Nature and has to obey natural laws it may well be argued that all his thoughts and actions are the result of natural forces. The science of behaviourism has shown that many of man's thoughts and actions are not voluntary, but are due to external and internal stimuli, and to inherited characteristics. Even the non-scientific among us know that a physical disturbance such as indigestion can affect the processes of the mind.

There can be no doubt that man's freewill is strictly limited. No man can disregard the laws of Nature with impunity, or will himself to live for ever under these laws.

The arguments against freewill, as they arise from a scientific analysis of human personality, are difficult to

refute, but as we have reason to believe that "design" makes the universe something more than the sum of its components, it is to design that we have to look for evidence of freewill. Freewill can become "self evident," not by itself, but only through its effects.

If we had no freewill all our thoughts and actions would have been pre-determined. They would be automatic reflexes to blind instincts and antecedent causes. But blind instinct is selfish. It is concerned solely with the well-being of the one organism and we know, as a fact of experience, that man has impulses that transcend the interests of the self. These impulses cannot be automatic reactions to fixed antecedent causes as they very often lead to something new, that is, something entirely different to what has gone before. They are progressive. They have enabled man to rise from a primitive form of life to the conscious psychic being that he is today. We cannot believe that the inspiration given to some great artist is due to some chance arrangement of particles of positive and negative electricity.

"Progressiveness" seems to be part of the design which runs through the universe but this does not mean that what we do automatically conforms to this design. If the design is progressive (in the widest physical and spiritual sense which we shall try to define later) then many of our actions obviously run counter to this design. It is only by a conscious effort of will that we do the "right." Had we no freewill, and knew it, we should have no incentive to make any form of progress, and progress, in the higher spheres at least, is impossible unless we, by conscious effort of will, subordinate our baser and stronger desires in favour of those which are higher, yet weaker.

Our main reason, however, for believing that man has freewill is based on moral grounds. All societies have formulated moral codes to guide human conduct. These codes differ widely, but they are in general agreement that what is "good" has social benefit. That is to say, the needs and desires of the individual have to take second place to the needs and desires of the society to which he belongs.

But if we have no freewill we have no need for moral codes as nothing we could do could be wrong. We should have no responsibility towards our fellow men. All our thoughts and actions would be concerned solely with gratifying our innate instincts. We should have no moral guidance, and without morality there would have grown up such an antagonism between man and man, that the human race would by now have destroyed itself. As the human race does exist, then so does morality, of which freewill is so necessary an ingredient.

CHAPTER 3

KNOWLEDGE

WE can solve a problem only by basing our premisses on facts that we already possess. How, and from where, we get these facts, and to what extent we can rely on them, are obviously matters of the greatest importance.

We get our knowledge from three sources. The first is the accumulated observations of man himself which we call science. For thousands of years scientists have been collecting data, experimenting and recording. Their achievements are common knowledge.

Scientific "facts," however, are not absolute truths. Not only are they subject to observational error, but with the progress of science they have to be modified, and, in some cases, are proved to be fallacious. Nevertheless, if we are to reason at all, we have to accept some of them at least as being true. Take, for example, the theory of evolution. The accumulated evidence in support of this theory is now so great that we have no alternative but to accept it, at least in its broad outlines. Scientists may differ about the details, but they are on common ground in believing that life is changing.

The second, which is an extension of the first, is the application of man's reasoning powers to the facts collected by the scientists. We know that an apple will fall to the ground if left unsupported, and from this, and

other observed similar phenomena, we infer the law of gravity. Knowledge is the intelligent interpretation of observed facts; it follows that if our facts are faulty, the results we arrive at will also be wrong.

Reason, in spite of the hopes placed upon it, cannot give us anything entirely new. When we add two two's together, we get four, but four is not an original conception. It is a compound of two two's.

Nevertheless, reason and science between them have made great strides. They have weighed the stars, split the atom, and given us a power over nature undreamed of even a hundred years ago. They have made such progress that there is a widespread belief that they will eventually uncover all the secrets of nature, that there is no phenomenon that will not sooner or later be "explained" by reason and science.

But this is a fallacy. A scientist can deal only with things which occupy or have an effect in space. He can dissect a man's body, explain the working of parts, but cannot say what makes those parts work. When an organism dies it does not lose weight, or size, but something which is not matter. A Beethoven sonata can be analysed into a certain number of notes of differing wavelengths, but science cannot explain why one particular arrangement of these notes should have the effect that it does. Both the living organism, and the sonata, are "something more" than the sum of their parts.

It is this "something more" which no scientist with his limited human faculties can comprehend. He can observe, and reason about its effects, but in the nature of things he cannot, and never will be able to, probe into, and experiment with, the thing itself. In the material sense it does not exist. Yet we know this "something more" to be real.

It follows that as science, plus reason, cannot have given us all the knowledge we have we must have a third source which is independent of human observation. There are many things which we know to be "true," which cannot be explained by any logical process of reasoning.

We all know of the thoughts and ideas which come to us unbidden; of the flash of inspiration given to a genius, or the ability to create something new which all living creatures possess to a greater or lesser degree. These cannot be, as some scientists would have us believe, the workings of the sub-conscious mind bringing to the surface something that has happened in the past. There must be something new under the sun, otherwise life could not have progressed. *No thought or idea can be entirely the product of human experience if it is original.*

It may be suggested that the mind is some kind of self-sufficient mechanism which is capable of originating new thoughts, and ideas for itself. This may be true to a limited extent—man certainly has creative abilities—but it cannot account for the knowledge we get from what we call instinct.

We "know," for example, that we have the "right" to live. The knowledge of this right seldom enters our consciousness but it is implicit in everything we do. All our hopes, fears, and actions are based on it. The right to live is not only instinctive, it is a fundamental truth. Without it we are nothing. Coupled with this knowledge is the knowledge of *how* to survive. The instinct of self-preservation is common to all forms of life, but it cannot be, as some scientists would have us believe, something which life itself has evolved to meet the needs of self-preservation. Although its methods are adapted to meet

changing circumstances, in its origin it cannot have been the outcome of either reason, or observation. The knowledge of how to survive must have come into existence with life itself.

This third source, from which we get our knowledge of immaterial things must come from some outside agency which, as it by-passes sense experience, cannot be rationally explained. Whatever it is it influences us far more than anything science can put forward. It transcends reason. We can call it revelation or intuition or extra-sensory perception.

We should not confuse this revelation with the "divine" revelation of theology. The power to receive it is not confined to the Hebrew prophets and other religious reformers. The bird had it when it built the first rudimentary nest; Beethoven had it when he composed his sonatas, and we all have it when the "voice of conscience" tells us that this, or that, is right or wrong.

Revelation is not necessarily of moral significance. In spite of the manifest benefits we get from it much of what it reveals we can only regard as evil. Not all the new thoughts and ideas introduced into our consciousness are for the good of mankind. All the same it is from revelation, or intuitive insight, that we get our perception of the higher, or moral values. Science can tell us what is good for us mentally and physically; brute instincts can tell us how to survive, but it is extra-sensory perception which makes us aware that there is a higher scale of values than that which is concerned solely with the well-being of the human animal. What this scale is and by whom, or what, it was laid down, is almost impossible to ascertain from the confused and often conflicting impressions we get from extra-sensory

perception. But in spite of this, preoccupation with higher values is such a part of our make-up that we cannot dismiss it as of no account. We have to try and discover the origin and meaning behind it all.

In forming any judgment we cannot ignore any of our sources of knowledge. Although we try to solve our problems by intellect alone, and without reference to traditional beliefs we have to recognise that many of the facts on which we base our reasoning are extra-sensory. Neither the scientists who refuse to accept the "facts" given by revelation because they cannot be "proved," nor the religious bigot who regards some sacred book as the sole repository of truth, can see reality.

The many apparent contradictions between science and revelation are due to our limited understanding. Either our scientific facts are wrong, or we have wrongly interpreted that which is revealed, or both. *It is only when we can get revelation, and our observational and reasoning powers to agree, that we shall know truth.*

WHAT SCIENCE AND REASON CAN NEITHER PROVE NOR DISPROVE

Chapter 4. THE EXISTENCE OF A FIRST CAUSE

The beginning—First Cause unknowable—Belief in First Cause “reasonable”—Cause and effect—“Awareness” of First Cause—The Absolute—God the Creator of both good and evil—The paradox of creation—One morality only—On what the majority agree—Disagreement as to what is the design behind phenomena—What is the Will of God?

CHAPTER 4

THE EXISTENCE OF A FIRST CAUSE

ALL the knowledge we have and from whatever source we get it leads us to one inevitable conclusion; that some Creative Force or Supreme Power exists which is responsible both for us, and for our environment. Without it the universe does not make sense.

Science may be able to trace the history of the world back through geological ages, and the birth of the planets to some nebulous cloud of gas, which itself can be atomised into nothing more than energy. It may even discover that life itself originated in the chance meeting of differing chemical elements. But this does not tell us where the primeval stuff of which the world is made came from. However far back in time we are able to go, we still have to postulate a beginning, a creation, and a first cause.

Neither can science tell us *why* the universe exists. Both creation, and the reason for it, are concepts which the human mind has to accept or reject without scientific confirmation.

Yet to us the hypothesis that some intelligent force is behind phenomena is a "reasonable" one. From our own observations we know that the universe is neither chaotic nor static. We know of the material things around us, of the natural laws under which we live, and of the changes which are taking place in all forms of life. It is

impossible for us to conceive of material things without a creator; laws without a lawgiver; or of changes without purpose.

Reason and observation tell us that there cannot be effects without a cause. When we study any phenomenon we find, sooner or later that we can trace it back to some cause. This cause then becomes to us an effect, for which we have, in turn, to find a further cause, and so on. This law of cause and effect has so often proved to be right that when we cannot find a cause for something that is, or happens, we are left in no doubt that somewhere or other there is one. By applying this law to the study of phenomena we shall, eventually, be able to understand all the changes that have taken place since the universe consisted of primeval world stuff. But when we try to find out what brought this world stuff into existence and why, we find that we have reached the limit of our observational powers. It is as if we stood on the edge of a cloud of nebulous substance and looked out into a void. Beyond the primeval world stuff there is nothing tangible for the mind to grasp. But the universe itself is real enough and reason, recognizing the law of cause and effect, tells us that somewhere in the void there must be a cause.

Whether or not matter is originally energy we leave for science to decide, but we know that the universe now is made up of these two "substances," matter and energy, and that the more significant one is energy. This vital force sets matter in motion, and some of this matter has been animated to such an extent that it has given us life. This energy is the driving force behind all phenomena, and has caused, and is still causing, tremendous changes in the composition of the universe. What the source of all this energy is, we cannot know. We can attribute

it only to some over-riding power, the first cause of all things. But one thing is certain. This force is not blind. When we see all the changes it has wrought we are left in no doubt that there is purpose behind it, and purpose implies an intelligent will to further it.

From revelation, which itself must originate with the first cause, we get an inner awareness of this power. We cannot prove its existence in the sense that a mathematical equation can be proved, but all our being tells us that it must be so. The knowledge that this power exists does not have to be learned; like the will to live, it is instinctive. In our day-to-day struggle for existence we push this awareness into the background as something fantastically remote from the prosaic needs of everyday life. But we cannot escape it. Sooner or later, and especially in times of stress, it floods back into our consciousness.

The belief in some supernatural power, or powers, is common to all mankind. It is found in the most primitive, and most isolated of communities, and in the most civilized. It is so widespread, both in time and place, that its recurrence cannot be due to coincidence. There must be something in man's make-up that makes this belief involuntary, and a primal necessity. Even the so-called atheist has it. However much he may deny its existence, he still believes in some abstraction outside the realms of reason and science. It may be social justice, or some political ideology, but whatever it is, it is something in which conscience plays a part, and in which he has to differentiate between good and evil. The awareness of good and evil is not an intellectual concept; it presupposes a scale of moral values, and something to provide the yard-stick. The belief in an overriding power

cannot be gainsaid; it is as fundamental a part of man's being as life and death.

Men's conceptions of this power have taken many forms, from a benign God to be worshipped, to a malignant power to be propitiated. To rationalize it, its attributes have been invested in such concrete objects as the sun, or some totem animal, and in such abstractions as humanism, or the powers of darkness. What it is, in the nature of things, will never be known. It occupies some non-dimensional sphere into which the human intellect cannot penetrate. It has no substance that we can visualize. The supreme power or first cause is something to which we cannot reach. It is its own "Why?" It is the Absolute. We call it God.

If we accept the supreme power as omnipotent we must not blind ourselves to the fact that it has created both that which we regard as good, and that which we regard as evil. It has given us jungle laws and human compassion; cancer in the human body, and a love of beauty. It tolerates the suffering of the innocent, and at the same time makes it possible for us to achieve supreme happiness.

To invent some satanic monster to blame for evil is futile. To visualize the powers that be as dual, one working for good, and the other for evil, does not reveal the Absolute. It is highly improbable that two contending forces should exist who would, or could, have created each other. However we look at it we are driven to the conclusion that there is one Supreme Power, and one only, and that all things come from this power, or God

It may be argued that as man is one of creation's works and has to obey creation's laws, he does not need a moral code, as all his actions are pre-determined. Fortunately

this is not the case. The paradox of creation is that it has not only given us "cruel" natural laws, but also a certain amount of freewill, humanitarianism, and reasoning ability with which to either combat or guide them.

Belief in the existence of God and in freewill is fundamental. Without it life is meaningless.

If God is the universal provider, then what is good or evil, right or wrong, is that which God wills. There can be no other morality. He alone is able to judge. It is impossible to believe in the Absolute and then turn to some other reference point for a scale of values.

The belief that we have a duty to carry out the will of the Supreme Power is common to all thinking men, whatever they think this power is, or is not. This belief is universal and instinctive and is the only logical outcome of a belief in the Supreme Power itself. Man has always tried to stand well with the unknown. His motives may have been fear of punishment, or hope of reward, but whatever they are, he has always tried to obey the dictates of whatever his personal god, or ideal, happens to be.

Using the facts, therefore, that we can "prove," and recognising many we cannot, we are in agreement with the majority of mankind on the following points:

That some Supreme Power created and still governs the universe; that this Power gave us creative gifts of our own, the power to reason, and freewill with which to form independent judgments; that good or evil, right or wrong, is that which this Power wills, and that all our actions, and any codes of conduct we may formulate, should be based on this will.

But belief in what is the will of God has led to grotesque results and many inconsistencies. The Christian,

believing that the Sermon on the Mount was the voice of God, has evolved a religion of compassion; but loving kindness is difficult to reconcile with the brutality inherent in God's creation of the laws relating to the survival of the fittest. The Aztec priest believed he was propitiating his deity by tearing out the heart of his living victim, but no priest could have carried out this hideous operation had he known anything of compassion.

Yet both the Christian saint and the Aztec priest acted in accordance with what they believed to be right, and, if actions are to be judged on motive alone, and without regard to the consequences, then both are equally moral.

When we consider the many fantastic forms religion has taken, the wars that have been fought about it (with men of good-will on both sides), the miseries inflicted on man, by man, in the name of God, it is obvious that some, or all, of these diametrically opposed ideas and opinions as to what is the will of God, must be wrong. *The great problem before mankind is not whether or not to obey the will of God, but to find out what it is.*

WHY WE CANNOT ACCEPT EXISTING BELIEFS

Chapter 5. FAITH

The leap to faith—What is true faith?—Contradictions of divine revelation—Faith and environment—The free-thinker.

Chapter 6. MYSTICISM

The mystics—Visions not necessarily Truth—Visions must pass the test of reason—Visions may have good or evil consequences—All come from God—The mystic abnormal—The mystic today.

Chapter 7. IMMORTALITY

The belief in personal immortality irrational—What does survive?—The influence of the individual on posterity—Reincarnation—The immortal life-stream.

Chapter 8. CHRISTIANITY

Christian God not the Creator—Christian appeal to self-interest—Christianity ignores part of divine purpose—Christian God a vicious God—The inconsistency of Christianity—The Bible versus the laws of the Creator—Christianity and magic—Christianity a necessity in present stage of evolution—The growing need for something greater.

CHAPTER 5

FAITH

IT is said that we can know the Will of God only through "divine revelation," that when our philosophical quest has reached the limit of observation and reason, then must come the "leap to faith."

This to a certain extent is true. A faith in something greater than the personal "I" is one of man's fundamental necessities. It gives him an explanation of the meaning of existence, without which he is rudderless. The psyche needs something outside and above itself to cling to, and as the urgings and desires that emanate from it are at times biologically irrational, this faith cannot be supplied by reason alone.

We know that much of our awareness is not the result of reason and observation but comes to us through revelation. For example, we accept as a fact beyond dispute our "right" to live. But we cannot know why we were granted this right. There is no logical reason why life should exist at all. All we can say is that we live by the will of the first cause, which is its own "why."

The seeker for truth cannot achieve his object by reason alone but neither can he ignore the facts he has gathered through observation and reason. Our senses and intellect are just as much "divine" gifts as the power to receive that which is revealed, and as we believe that nothing exists without a purpose, these gifts were

intended to be used. We should be wrong to accept a faith on extra-sensory perception alone. However much it may urge on us the righteousness of some particular faith, we cannot accept this faith if it does not conform to the observed facts of the universe. How can we accept anything as being true that God's creation itself proclaims to be absurd?

We realize that our belief in the existence of a Supreme Power or first cause is, in the last analysis, an "act of faith" but it is not a faith based on intuition, or religious mysticism alone. Like any scientific hypothesis it has observed facts and logic to support, if not to prove it. A leap to faith should not be a leap in the dark.

How then is the doubter to know what to believe? In the world to-day there are many faiths, many explanations of what lies behind phenomena. Is the one and only true faith Christianity? Muhammedanism? Buddhism?; some abstraction like humanism or just plain black magic? There are as many opinions as to what is the true faith as there are faiths.

The Christian will tell us that Christianity alone is true, that it was revealed to mankind through "divine revelation" and that divine revelation, as it is the voice of God, transcends all the observational and reasoning powers of man himself. To achieve the blessings of Christianity one must embrace it without reservations. There must be no ifs and buts. It is only by doing this that the seeker for truth can see the "inner light," behold a vision of God, and know beyond any shadow of doubt that Christianity is indeed truth, the truth of God.

But the Muslim too believes that his religion is the "true" faith; that it was revealed to mankind by God (Allah) through divine revelation. And the same claim

is made for many other faiths. All religions have their mystics who claim to have seen the inner light, and who have passed on visions of reality to their followers.

It is obvious that these differing revelations cannot all be the authentic voice of the one universal God. If they were we should have one vision of reality, not many; one religion not a multitude of warring sects. To say that the "divine revelation" of one religion comes from God while that of others does not is an assertion which, in the nature of things, cannot be proved. The Muslim is just as much in the right when he claims that the will of God was revealed to Muhammad as the Christian is when he makes this claim on behalf of Jesus. Divine revelation, like anything else that is revealed, must come, directly or indirectly, from the maker of all, but it cannot be His intention that it should be used as a guide to truth. "Divine" revelation contradicts itself.

The faith to which the majority attach themselves is chosen for them by the accident of birth. This is true not only of "illiterates," but also of men of intelligence and education. The Christian theological student *after comparing the merits of different religions* will invariably come to the conclusion that Christianity is truth; but his Muslim counterpart, taking similar studies, will be left in no doubt about the superiority of Islam. Both will have approached the subject with what they believe to be open minds, but as they arrive at different conclusions, their respective traditions and upbringing must have been too strong for their reasoning powers.

It is only the exceptional individual who can overcome this bias of tradition and environment, and become that bugbear of all established religion, a freethinker. It is tremendously difficult to take a detached view of what

lies behind phenomena when one has to set aside one's spiritual heritage, criticize the teachings one received in childhood, and receive the opprobrium of one's unthinking fellow men. It is much easier, and more comforting to swim with the tide. But if we are to know truth, to know what is the will of God, it has to be done. There is no other way.

CHAPTER 6

MYSTICISM

AMONG the greatest influences on human thought have been the "experiences" of the "mystics." A mystic is a man who goes "out into the wilderness" and, by intense concentration and asceticism rids his mind of all mundane affairs. He gets himself into such a state of receptiveness, that he is able to see the "inner light"; to hold communion with God. In this communion he is made aware of certain "truths"; truths which transcend all reason and observation. He is the recipient, not of the revelation or intuition granted to ordinary mortals, but of a "divine revelation" possible only to those in the most advanced state of "holiness."

These revelations cannot be "explained" or proved. They are more in the nature of visions than messages. Truths are revealed in blinding flashes, without proof of why they are truths.

Many of these revelations have been put into writing. They are to be found in the Bible, the Qu'rán, and other religious books. They are part of man's cultural heritage.

The ordinary man, as he cannot partake of these experiences, can neither confirm nor deny their genuineness. But many millions of ordinary people do believe in them, not through intellectual conviction, but because they are emotionally satisfying. The revelations of the Christian mystic may differ from those of his Muslim

counterpart, but both fit into their respective, and inherited, cultural and spiritual backgrounds. Both are somehow "right."

This "believing," although it has been greatly helped by the constant reiteration of certain dogmas in the emotional atmosphere of religious observances, is primarily due to an elemental need for security. Man, blindly groping about among the dark mysteries of life has clung to these "truths" of revelation as a drowning man clutches a straw. In his desperate need for something tangible he has elevated them into "divine" truths; truths which on no account must be criticized. They have become the alleged voice of God.

But, if we are to take a rational view of these things, we have to rid ourselves of the emotionalism so often associated with mysticism, and look at them sensibly. We know that much of our knowledge comes from extra-sensory, or supernatural sources, but we cannot accept the uncorroborated evidence of any individual, however holy, as evidence of what is, or is not, the will of the Supreme Power.

That intuitive perception which comes in visions has nothing to do with holiness. It is given to the artist when he has a vision of creation that has not been seen before, and to all "inspired" individuals who contribute something new to experience. Visions come to the lunatic, and the evil-doer, as well as to the saint.

If all visions were revelations of divine truth, i.e. if they were the authentic voice of the one God, then we should expect them to be consistent. But they are not. The old Mosaic law of an eye for an eye is totally at variance with the 'love thine enemies' taught by Jesus. Yet both messages are "divine."

Moreover it does seem strange that a Universal God when passing on messages to mankind should confine these messages to just a few selected individuals. When the prophets of Israel were hailing the coming of the Messiah why was this information not being broadcast throughout the length and breadth of all the known, and unknown world? Why were the mystics of India, or the barbarian Celts of Britain never given these glad tidings? Why was this vital information made known to no more than a few favoured individuals belonging to one insignificant tribe of Semites living in a small locality on the shores of the Mediterranean? One would expect a "divine" message to be of universal, not parochial significance. After all, the first cause of all things must be something more than the tribal God of the Hebrews.

All visions are effects due to phenomena which, like everything else that is perceived, will eventually be traced back to the unknowable first cause, to God. For this reason they are all in a sense "divine," but this does not mean that they are all "moral." Visions can have either good or evil consequences.

Some visions, moreover, have the fantasy of lunacy, and belief in them is liable to cause the mind which accepts them as truth, to partake of this lunacy. This is why we cannot accept visions as aspects of truth unless they are "reasonable."

Mystical experiences may, or may not, be of value to the human race. They seem to be granted to different individuals without rhyme or reason. As they differ so much in content they serve no common cause. The truth is we choose our own pet mystics. We grant "holiness" not to the mystics of all times, and places, but only to those whose visions conform to our own moral tradition.

That is why no vision, or revelation can be universally accepted as revealing the purpose behind phenomena while the human race is divided metaphysically.

Many visions have been acclaimed as messages from God because, in the light of human knowledge at the time it seemed "reasonable" to believe that they were so and no evidence was then available to prove that they were not. When it was "revealed" that God created man in his own image nothing at the time would seem more feasible. But now we know that He did not.

We should regard mystics as inspired men and women, but inspired in an irrational and amoral way. But in spite of this, we should not reject offhand everything that is revealed. Inspiration is the source of all progress. What we need to do is to treat these visions as we do scientific hypotheses. Set them up and make them pass the test of reason and observation. As we have said before, we can know truth, or rather approach it, only when science and extra-sensory perception agree as to what it is.

We should remember that visions are the products of minds in an abnormal state. Some of the truths revealed may be to human good but so may be the mouthings of a raving lunatic. We know from psychology that an individual, when in a state of self-hypnosis, is susceptible to almost any influence, whether it comes from external stimuli, or from the sub-conscious mind. We know from dreams that the mind can be irrational and create fantasies, and we know that the germ of an idea can develop in the mind to such an extent that it becomes an obsession which the mind itself cannot criticize. It becomes a "faith" and faith, though it may be irrational, can move mountains.

No prophet could survive for long in this sceptical age if he prophesied something which we knew from the findings of science could not be true. Neither would his uncorroborated evidence be accepted in any modern court of law. If he persisted in his assertions he would be regarded, if not with derision, or pitying contempt, as a mental curiosity and fit for psychiatric treatment.

CHAPTER 7

IMMORTALITY

MYSTICISM has given rise to a widespread belief in personal immortality; a belief that the soul, or some other non-material part of the individual survives the destruction of the body to live on in some Valhalla, or purgatory, according to whether or not the individual concerned has led a good or bad life as judged by the current beliefs of his time and place.

But when we see the utter finality of death, and watch the body decompose into its constituent elements, we can see no justification for this belief. The human being, in spite of his many-sidedness, is one and indivisible. The soul needs the body to house it, and the mind to give it consciousness.

It may be said that as the soul is not matter it is not subject to the laws of physics and cannot be destroyed. If this were so a case could be made out for the survival of the mind, the emotions, or any other non-material part of man's being. We should have to admit the possibility of some disembodied intelligence existing capable of solving mathematical problems, or of planning a bank robbery. The notion of immortality, or of immortality as generally understood, is fantastic.

What has given rise to this belief is the known fact that the influence of the individual on future generations never dies. We know that when a man reproduces

himself, a living part of him is perpetuated in his children; a part which contains within itself all the biological and *psychical qualities* of his forbears; qualities which are the outcome of eons of evolution. Even the childless individual, with his influence on the present, leaves his mark on the future.

This influence can be seen in the child with the blue eyes of its parents, and in all the *inherited spiritual* and biological qualities that differentiate us from the beasts. It affects us profoundly. It permeates all our conscious and unconscious life. It is the "essence" which gives rise to all psychical phenomena.

But in spite of evidence to the contrary from the mystics, and from spiritualistic mediums, we believe that a rational explanation can be found for these psychical phenomena. Take for example the individual A. He, after coalescing with another individual B, produces C. C inherits the characteristics of both A and B and when we speak to C, we are in effect speaking to a living some thing of A, even though A as an individual no longer exists. We may even be conscious of this indirect communication, especially when the characteristics C has inherited from A, predominate over those from B.

We know that two minds which are sufficiently in harmony can transmit telepathic messages to each other even when they are far apart, and not under the same environmental influences. This makes it reasonable to suppose that messages, or influences can be transmitted to us from a dead A, by way of a living C. C may be unaware of this, but if our psyche is attuned to what remains of A in C, they will, in some way or other, have an effect on us.

Through what medium we get these influences we do not know as yet, but with the advance of science it is reasonable to suppose that we shall eventually. It may be found that living tissue itself gives off some form of radiation which causes reaction in other similar tissue, which, in turn, affects the mind attached to this recipient tissue. The possibility of this discovery being made is not fantastic when we remember that we have already discovered other forms of radiation such as bands of light outside the visible spectrum, and cosmic rays, neither of which are perceptible to the unaided senses.

These psychical influences should not be dismissed as figments of the imagination because we cannot fully understand them. But one thing is clear. They are not a form of intuition that comes direct to us from God. They are impulses from one individual to another. We all thrill when we see or hear particular individuals even when not in physical contact with them. The thrill we get from seeing them is transmitted to us by light waves while that from hearing is by sound vibrations. Both are a form of radiation which impinge directly on to the senses. They convey messages which are clear, and which can be interpreted by the conscious mind.

But it seems to us that this communion with the "dead" is more likely to be unconscious than otherwise. We all have at times a feeling of restlessness, of not knowing what is the matter with us. We know that something is affecting us that cannot be attributed to physical causes. We have a feeling that something is urging us to do something or other, we know not what.

These vague psychical influences working on the subconscious self occasionally come to the surface, especially when the mind is in a mystical state. They may appear

as personal messages from A, or as visions of him in some celestial paradise. But these messages, visions and what not, are of necessity distorted. The influences which give rise to them are so mixed up with our own psychological yearnings that it is impossible to separate them. In any case A's influence on us is not direct. It comes to us from C, who is an amalgam of A and B.

This living influence which our ancestors have over us, is the basis of the belief in re-incarnation. We know from evolutionary biology that, even after several generations, some descendant of A, whom we will call D, may, owing to the many and various combinations that have given rise to him, gather to himself all, or nearly all, of the physical, mental, and spiritual characteristics of A. D can never be identical with A, but the difference may be so slight that D is, in effect, a re-incarnation of A. D is what is known as a biological throwback.

The life and death of an individual is a minor event in the progress of Race. It starts when some living seed of the life stream germinates; it ends when the individual dies and all his spiritual, and biological characteristics, are absorbed back into the life stream. The individual lives on, not as an individual, but as a potent influence on the future. The life cycle of individual is not dust to dust, but Race to Race.

It is this "influence" which is immortal, not the personal "I".

CHAPTER 8

CHRISTIANITY

WHATEVER the Supreme Power is, it is not the God of the Christians. Christian teachings do not fit the facts of creation as we know them to-day. They are based on the false assumption that man is some kind of "divine" being who has fallen from grace, but we know now that he is basically as one with the rest of living creatures. He is a risen animal, not a fallen angel.

Christianity as taught does not appeal to the best in us. It tells us that if we obey the will of God, that is, the will of God as interpreted by the churches, great shall be our reward in heaven. It adds, although not so vehemently as it did, that if we do not, then we shall suffer the torments of eternal damnation. This attitude to what after all is our duty to God, is based on the carrot and the big stick. It is an attitude which shews the trading mentality Christianity inherited from Judaism of which it is an offshoot. Christianity would have us do a deal with deity.

To us the idea implicit in Christianity that we should obey the will of God to further our own ends is revolting. In spite of what may have been revealed to Christian mystics to the contrary, and in spite of the threats and promises involved, all our intuitive sense of right and wrong tells us that somewhere in the divine scheme of things there is a higher morality, a greater good than that

of self-interest. The Supreme Power is not a God to be bargained with.

Christianity teaches only part of what is the will of God. It tells us of the beauty of creation, but not of its brutality. It rightly interprets the will of God when it tells us to love our enemies, but omits to tell us that when these enemies stand in our way we should destroy them. The Maker of all, through the survival instincts He has given us, does not tell us to turn the other cheek, but to fight, and to fight hard against anything which retards the physical, mental, and spiritual evolution of the human species.

Christianity ignores the mental and physical aspects of human progress, of evolution. When the Church unites a couple in "holy matrimony" it is not concerned with the biological qualities of any offspring of this union. Children may be born who inherit feeble-mindedness or disease to such an extent that they are doomed to a lifetime of suffering. Yet the Church, ignoring the discoveries of science relating to heredity, will give its blessing to such a union. All they are concerned with is the orthodoxy of the couple it unites and that the children of this union should be brought up to a belief in the brand of Christianity that particular church advocates. Does not the writer of that profound truth "And the sins of the fathers shall be visited on the children unto the third and fourth generation" warn us against the evil consequences of marriage without safeguards for the future?

God as the Creator of all cannot be wrong. He is a righteous God, but not an all loving God in the Christian sense. Although pain and suffering are abhorrent to Him He does not succour the weak; He mercifully destroys them.

Christian teaching is inconsistent. It tells us that the Almighty God created a fiery hell into which the wicked are to be cast, not for a period, mark you, as a just punishment for their sins, but for all eternity. If this was true the Christian God would be guilty of atrocious cruelty incomparably greater than anything that could be found in raw nature. How Christian theology can reconcile this concept of a vicious God with the all loving Father of Jesus, is beyond our comprehension.

Christianity has survived only by the Christians themselves being inconsistent. The rise of western civilization was due not to the spread of Christianity, as is sometimes claimed, but in spite of it. Civilization does not grow by pacific means. It is a delicate plant which has to be nurtured and defended against the barbarian from without. When the hordes of Asia were overrunning Europe the Christian inhabitants did not return good for evil. They fought, and fought rightly, to save their own way of life. Perhaps the spirit animating Europe throughout those dark ages was best shewn by those noblest of all Christians, those irrational inconsistents, the Crusaders, who said in effect: we believe in Christianity, in the gospel of turning the other cheek: and who then died, sword in hand, trying to defend it. It is not the will of God that the meek should inherit the earth.

When we come to Jesus himself and strip him of the fantastic structure that organized religion has built around him, we see a simple man preaching a gospel of compassion; a gospel which was not only a much-needed counter-weight to the barbarities of his time, but which is a good for all time. He was a great teacher, and kindly man and as such he was someone we can all love, and respect.

But we cannot accept the mythical story of his origin, of his immaculate conception. When we are asked to believe that Jesus was the "son" of that Supreme Power which created a universe in which the fittest survive and the weak are destroyed, we are asked to believe in fantasies. Had Jesus been the son of the Absolute he would have taught us something more than to be compassionate. He would have told us of the many-sidedness and diversities of his Father.

The belief that Jesus was a divine or supernatural being is based on the testimony of the writers of the four Gospels. To substantiate their claim these writers allege that miracles were brought about by Jesus, or occurred in connection with his stay on earth.

But if a miracle is something which happens which is contrary to the laws of nature, and as these laws were laid down by the Creator himself, then miracles are events which are contrary to the will of God. It is said that as God is responsible for these laws, He can if he wills, set them aside. This may be true, but it is against all human experience to believe that He actually did so. There is no archaeological or other scientific evidence to support this belief.

It is believed by followers of other religions that miracles occurred in connection with the lives of *their* founders, but on rational grounds Christians do not accept the reports of these miracles as being true. Belief in them would outrage common sense. Then why should we accept Christian miracles alone as truth? If we are to believe that the laws of God were set aside on some occasions, why not on others?

There is no rational proof that miracles have occurred but there is ample evidence that they did not, and could

not. Take the miracle of the loaves and fishes, the record of which tells us that after the feeding of the multitude more loaves and fishes were collected than were originally distributed. When we take Y from X the result cannot be X plus. This is a truth which stands outside and above any system of metaphysics. It is a mathematical truth. God himself cannot take two from four, and leave five.

We do not believe that much of what is written in the Bible was intended to be taken literally. When it was recorded that Jesus "rose from the dead" was not the writer referring to the "spirit" of Jesus and not to the body? And is not the "spirit" that "influence" which all individuals exert biologically and spiritually on future generations?

It is stated that Jesus was the "son of God," but we cannot accept this as being true and at the same time regard him as a supernatural being, that is, someone fundamentally different to the rest of the human species. But it is quite true to say that Jesus was a son of creation. We all are. If God is the creator of all, then we are all "sons of God."

It is said that the Bible is a revelation of God. But on what grounds? No part of it was written by Jesus himself, and to believe that it was dictated to certain scribes by that first cause of all things which designed particles of positive and negative electricity, is fantastic. If the Bible is a revelation of God, then so is some scientific treatise on botany which reveals to us part of God's creation.

The Bible was written by fallible human beings like ourselves. They collected their material from eyewitnesses, and from oral accounts, in some cases many years after the events recorded. Their accounts differ, as

inevitably they must. We all know what garbled and contradictory accounts we get from eyewitnesses of a motor accident an hour after the event, let alone years.

Much harm has been done to the fine spiritual character of Jesus by attributing to him divine origin and the gift of magic. There are millions outside the Christian Church who respect Jesus as an inspired teacher (inspired that is in the same sense that all great men are inspired) but who cannot accept him as a divinity, and who are revolted by the attempt to bring a noble personality down to the level of a witch doctor.

There can be no doubt that during the credulous times when Christianity first arose, the leaders of the Church found it expedient to foster the belief in the supernatural origin of Jesus. Mankind had lived for ages believing in magic, and before Christianity could take hold of the masses magic had to be brought into it. Magic still holds sway over much of mankind, but fortunately for human spiritual progress the first cause of all things is now giving us a clearer, if not yet complete, picture of what lies behind phenomena. We have to thank God for gradually lifting from us the dark shadow of primitive superstition.

But no one in his right senses who has the interest of human progress at heart would want to destroy Christianity or any other of the great religions. Although the Christian explanation of what lies behind phenomena cannot pass the test of reason and science, the codes of everyday conduct which Christianity teaches are to human good. They may not cater for all of man's psychological needs, but they do further his spiritual progress. Christianity is wrong when it tells us that the story of Adam and Eve is historical fact, but when it teaches

what is perhaps the greatest of all ethics, "Do unto others as you would have them do to you," it is advocating a principle which is far older than Christianity, and one universally accepted as good by all thinking men whether Christian or not.

Even Christian metaphysics, false though they are now proved to be, have served mankind's purpose. They gave the only explanation of what lies behind phenomena that was available until modern times, and some explanation of the mysteries of life, however irrational it may eventually prove to be, is one of man's fundamental necessities. During the long course of his evolution, man has always needed a spiritual background to give him moral stability, and a code of conduct for dealing with his fellow men. This, Christian metaphysics has done for nearly 2,000 years, and in doing so it has been a "good," but not a good associated with truth.

But man progresses and as his knowledge of the universe increases his spiritual and psychological needs change, and with them his conception of truth. Dogmatic religion, however, cannot change without admitting its fallibility. The consequence is that many religions after supplying a much needed want become out-moded. They fail in their primary purpose of giving a satisfactory explanation of Reality. They fade away and are replaced by other movements and ideas which are more in harmony with current evolution. No religion can survive if it does not adapt itself to the evolutionary progress of its adherents. No humanly devised religion, and all religions are the product of human psychology, can be a truth for all time.

Christianity is at present in the fading stage, not only in the number of its nominal adherents but in the hold

it has over the hearts, and minds of men. But it still can, and does, play its part. The spiritual evolution of the majority of men is still in that stage when the carrot and the big stick are necessary, when paradoxically we have to appeal to man's self-interest to get him to be selfless. The world is not yet ripe for an entirely selfless religion. There is nothing better in the foreseeable future to take the place of Christianity. No movement, or religion, has yet arisen to give that more comprehensive explanation of the universe which modern knowledge has made so imperative, and which man, in his upward progress, will increasingly demand. If we destroy Christianity now we create a vacuum. The totem pole is better than nothing.

CREATION AS SEEN BY A NON-SPECIALIST

Chapter 9. EVOLUTION THE DESIGN OF THE FIRST CAUSE

Present concepts of reality unsatisfactory—Truth from study of phenomena—The changing universe—Darwinism not enough—Evolution both spiritual and biological—Evolution part of the divine scheme—Man's place in evolution—Sensory and extra-sensory agreement on need for progress—Man's relationship to the lower animals—Evolution selfish—Evolutionary changes not necessarily progressive—Man's duty to evolution.

Chapter 10. THE INDIVIDUAL

The "I" and the "We"—Biological improvement and spiritual values—The soul—Purpose of soul improvement of species—Lower and higher spiritual impulses—The soul's dependence on mind and body—The individual biologically and spiritually one.

Chapter 11. THE SPECIES

Human species something more than the sum of its parts—Numbers infinite—The highest work of God—Individual temporary member of species—Higher values directed towards improvement of species not individuals—The suffering of the innocents—Concept of oneness of species difficult to grasp—The individual's duty to species.

Chapter 12. HUMAN VARIETIES

Many varieties one species—Inevitable disappearance of varieties—Disappearance by re-admixture—The survival of the fittest variety—Progress depends on variety—White supremacy temporary—The need for co-operation between varieties—The desirability of a vertical colour bar.

Chapter 13. INEQUALITY

No two individuals alike—Good and bad qualities unevenly distributed—Injustice of inequality—The evolutionary value of inequality—Leadership by the best-endowed necessary for progress—Man gives preference to the fittest—Inequality the work of God.

Chapter 14. THE WILL TO POWER

No progress without aggression—The will to power amoral—Will to power an dexpanding life—Group aggressiveness transcends the “I”—Wars in moderation—Necessity of curbing will to power of individuals and groups in favour of species.

Chapter 15. THE UNITY OF CREATION

Primal law of creation—Its brutality—Its righteousness—Survival of fittest non-progressive—The progressive soul—Selfless idealism—The two aspects of creation—Essential unity of creation.

Chapter 16. GOOD AND EVIL

The enigma of evil—The desired end—Only one scale of values—Why does God allow it?—The evolutionary value of evil—No progress without opposition—Re-appraisal of good and evil—Good and evil in time and place—A good not necessarily truth—Fight against evil never ends—Evil a necessity.

Chapter 17. RIVAL GOODS

Biological versus spiritual goods—Spiritual good a recent phenomena—Spiritual overgrowth—God's two conflicting voices—Compromise between rival goods—Difficulty of deciding between rival goods—The eternal good.

Chapter 18. OUR BELIEFS AND WHAT THEY IMPLY

Our fundamental beliefs—Their origin—On what they are based—Inability of science to alter them—Application of beliefs to everyday life—Their revolutionary effect on modern thought—God not a democrat—Happiness not primary purpose of Creation—Happiness a by-product of harmony with First Cause—Individuals not unique—Heaven and Hell—Change the only constant—Our one “must”—The shortcomings of existing religion—Decline of civilizations—Death the natural order of things—The many-sided God—No reward, no punishment—The need to modify modern concepts of right—Difficulty of changing one's outlook—The higher morality.

CHAPTER 9

EVOLUTION, THE DESIGN OF THE FIRST CAUSE

IN the light of modern knowledge no existing religion gives an entirely satisfactory explanation of what lies behind phenomena, neither does science. (In any case these explanations are so contradictory that all are suspect.) As we, the doubters, cannot get a unanimous verdict on what is the will of God, we have no alternative than to seek it for ourselves.

The only way we can do this is to study the universe He created. If we accept the Supreme Power as the maker of all, then all phenomena whether physical, or psychical, must be caused, directly or indirectly, by this Power. As direct knowledge of what this Power is, is beyond human understanding, we can divine its purpose only by studying these phenomena; by assessing the nature of the cause from its effects. No explanation of what is the will of God, whether it comes from mystical sources or not, can be true if it does not agree with the laws of nature, of creation. How can it be, if it contradicts the laws of God himself? The claim that God caused miracles to occur, that is, set aside His own natural laws for the sake of enlightening mankind in some particular "faith," is the height of presumption. There is no evidence for these aberrations of nature (outside the psychology of mysticism).

We can know the will of God only by inference, but whatever we infer has to pass the test of reason and observation. Truth has to satisfy both science and the psyche, both reason and revelation. For example, we cannot accept the story of Adam and Eve as being true now that we know that man has evolved from some lowlier form of life.

When we come to study the universe the most significant fact that we find about it is that it is continually changing. Nothing is eternal in form. We know from science that the world is in a state of flux; that not only are the hills and valleys being uplifted and worn down again, but that every living creature in it is gradually being modified. We know from history that mankind (in spite of new atrocities committed during modern wars) is gradually becoming more humane; that the voice of conscience is making itself heard more than it did, and that our ideas of right and wrong are changing with the centuries.

Little or nothing was known about these vast changes until comparatively recently. It used to be believed that all organisms were brought into being in their present form by one act of creation. But in the last hundred years or so, with the discovery of fossils, and by the study of biology, man has come to realize that he has not always been what he is to-day, but that he has evolved from some more primitive form of life. It is this gradual, almost imperceptible changing of one form of life into something higher and more complex; this unfolding of life; this "becoming" that we call evolution.

The physical causes of biological changes have been fully explained by students of life. Darwin's theory of evolution by natural selection is now generally accepted by all

scientists. In this theory it is pointed out that the characteristics of some individual organisms deviate from the norm of the species to which they belong, and that when the deviation is one which favours survival, it gives the individual concerned a better chance of living to reproduce itself than the less fortunate. This means that the deviation will (given time), become widely diffused throughout the species with the result that the characteristics of the species as a whole will gradually change. No one can quarrel with this theory. It is sound common sense.

But this theory does not go far enough. It does not explain why one embryo develops into an abnormal adult while others, conceived by the same parents and brought up in the same environment do not. Environmental influences weed out the less fit and thereby modify species, but this does not account for a "sport," which is an organism which shews a marked deviation from birth. It does appear that environment can cultivate, and modify deviations, but cannot originate them. This does not mean that a deviation which has been developed in some individual cannot be passed on to the individual's offspring in its more advanced form. It obviously can, otherwise there could have been no unfolding of life, no evolution. The potentiality for change must lie in characteristics which have been inherited, and which lie dormant in the germ cell waiting for favourable conditions to bring them to fruition.

Scientists, by studying the laws of inheritance, are coming to a better understanding of what causes deviations. They are enabling us now, if we would but listen, to avoid bringing into the world undesirable characteristics, and will, in a more enlightened age, help us to

produce the desirable ones. Scientists however have their limitations. They are tracing the effects of inheritance back to antecedent causes with some success, but in time they will inevitably come back to the first cause of all things which is unknowable.

Evolution is something more than a biological process, and cannot be fully explained by attributing all changes to automatic reactions to physical, material causes. Changes are taking place, not only in inorganic and organic matter, but also in that part of man's being which we call the "soul". Man is something more than flesh, blood, and brains. We know from experience that he has a spiritual side, and we know from history that both the biological and the spiritual aspects of him are subject to evolution.

Science can deal with the physical aspects of being and to some extent with the mental, but it is up against a blank wall when it tries to account for the spiritual. Spiritual knowledge does not result from empirical methods. It comes from extra-sensory perception. To fully understand the purpose behind creation, we need all the scientific knowledge that we can get, but we still have to reckon with God.

As there are so many vague and conflicting ideas as to what is meant by "spiritual," we cannot have anything but muddled thinking about what lies behind phenomena unless we define what we ourselves mean by it. This we shall try to do in the next chapter when we consider the make-up of the individual.

Evolution, and we shall continue to use the word in its widest sense, must be part of God's plan for the universe. It does seem that the Supreme Power is engaged on some gigantic operation to make life, both physically

and spiritually, something different to what it is. What the ultimate pattern (if any) is intended to be we do not know, but it must be one which suits the Creator's purpose better than the present.

We may well ask ourselves where we stand among all these changes. If we, and all other forms of life, have evolved from the same primeval speck of living matter, why should evolution, or anything else, concern us more than it does the birds and the beasts? Why should we be the only living things aware of these tremendous changes? In spite of a common ancestry, there must be something which differentiates us from the animal kingdom. Somewhere along the long line of evolution we must have been lifted to a higher plane. Whether or not this has been brought about by an acceleration of the evolutionary process, or by direct intervention, we do not know, but the fact remains that our position in the evolutionary cycle is unique. We have greater intellect, better reasoning powers, more creative gifts, and far more ability to receive revelation than any other living things. We are the only form of life which, by using these powers, can consciously alter its environment and thereby affect the course of evolution.

We are left in no doubt that the Supreme Power by granting us these powers has chosen us for a special purpose, and that purpose can only be to help on the evolutionary changes with which it is engaged. In this campaign we are not puppets, we have the initiative of the private soldier; and, although we cannot contravene the laws of nature with impunity, we have our part to play.

We realize that we can have no influence over many of the evolutionary processes. If it is the will of God that

two stars should collide, or that there should be an earthquake, or other natural disaster, there is nothing, at least in our present stage of knowledge, that we can do about it, however catastrophic it may be. But however limited our powers, we believe that not only can we help in the evolution of the human species, but also that we "must."

All human experience, whether sensory, or extra-sensory, points to human progress as being at least part of the design of the first cause. Intuitively we are aware that we have a duty to seek the higher values, and our observational powers and even common sense tell us that if life is to change, it should be made to change for the better, that is, the better by some acceptable standard.

Serving the cause of evolution is not a new ideal or must. All human activities which are generally regarded as "good" are, in some way or other, directed towards this end. Religion tries to help man's spiritual progress; "social service," in whatever form it takes, is an attempt to bring that mental contentment which we call happiness; while science, by increasing man's power over nature, helps him physically, and materially. These varied activities may not succeed in their objects, but the driving force behind them all is an intuitive, instinctive, and "reasonable" urge towards human betterment.

As evolution is both spiritual and biological, it follows that if we make progress in spiritual matters and neglect the biological, or vice versa, we shall serve only a part of the creative purpose. Evolution has to take note of everything that causes change, whether it be in inorganic matter, or in the body, or spirit of man.

We shall never make satisfactory human progress while we try to divorce the spiritual from the biological. For

reasons that we shall give when we come to study the individual, a human being cannot be divided into flesh and spirit. He is a complex of both. He is one indivisible whole, and has to be treated as such.

Who then will quarrel with our contention that we have a duty to evolution, i.e. evolution as we have defined it? There may be disagreement as to who, or what, imposed this duty on us, but nobody can deny that it exists. Every individual, however mixed his motives, tries to improve either himself or his fellow men up to standards which may not be those of Creation, but, those which he himself regards as desirable.

If we accept the view that human progress, in its widest sense, is an essential part of the design of the first cause, then we can take it for granted that God's evolutionary purpose is to make us into something better than we are; that is, something more in accordance with His will. This can only mean the evolution of some form of spiritual, mental, and physical superman; spiritual to enable him to hear the voice of God; mental to help him to interpret it; and physical to help him to carry it out. The better the equipment we have, the better we shall serve God's purpose.

Here we may ask why, if all life is the work of the Creator, we should concern ourselves with man only. If we and the lower animals have evolved from the same primal organisms, they too should have rights and privileges equal to our own.

But we have to take the universe as the creator made it, and not as idealism would like it to be. Life, which was originally one flowing river, has divided into a number of different streams, or species. These species are distinct in that they can no longer coalesce and produce fertile

offspring. Each species has been given a divine instinct to live at all costs, and it can do so only by preying on the others. Except for the most primitive of organisms, each species needs other species for food. Man himself needs animal products if he is to live at all. It follows that if we put the interests of the lower animals before those of our own we are disobeying the Creator's inexorable law of survival.

Evolution is the work of God. It is the act of creation which is still going on. Nevertheless it is "selfish." If we have to choose between the life of a man, and that of an animal, we instinctively choose the former. Even the most "saintly" of humans is more concerned with the moral uplift of some fellow man than he is with cultivating the nobler qualities of, say, a dog or a horse. Yet this attitude to other creatures is right. If we have been placed on a higher plane, and are to serve the Creator's evolutionary purpose, then in the destruction necessary for survival we have the right to take precedence. In obeying the laws of God we are concerned with the well-being of the lower animals only insofar as it affects our own. This does not mean cruelty to animals. Cruelty in any form is inimical to our own spiritual welfare.

We can serve no greater purpose than that of furthering the evolution of the human species. Evolution as it is is not necessarily progress. There are times when mankind is slipping back by whatever standard we take, whether it be that of biological science, our own intuitive sense of right and wrong, or by that of the Christian God, and during those periods of moral sickness to which mankind is liable after a few generations of material well-being, it may be by all three. Evolution needs

guidance and guidance from us as the only form of life capable of giving it.

There is one "good" and one only; that is to help the human race to rise to something greater than it is. Whatever is right or wrong, good or evil, is that which furthers or retards this end. It is the will of God.

CHAPTER 10

THE INDIVIDUAL

BEFORE we can take practical steps to improve man we need to know something of his make-up.

Man's being can be divided into two parts. One is what we (for our purpose) call the "biological," and the other is the spiritual. The former is man as an individual, the latter is that part of the individual which deals with the individual's relationship to his fellow men, to the human species as a whole. It is the difference between the "I" and the "We."

We have, of necessity, to study the two sides separately as what we know of biological processes comes from observation and reason, while our knowledge of spiritual matters is mainly intuitive. When doing so, however, we should *always remember that* as the species cannot exist without the individual, and as the individual is part of the species, when considering what is good for the one, *never to forget* what consequences it may have for the other.

The biological, or "I" side of man includes not only the physical parts of his make-up, but also all the mental and emotional processes that are concerned with his survival and well-being as an individual. Although the former is material, and the latter is not, both aspects of the individual can be studied scientifically. There is no mysticism about them. It is to physiologists, psychologists,

eugenists, in fact to all men of science, that we have to look for biological improvement.

Biological improvement, however, cannot be left entirely to science. It is of vital concern not only to us as individuals, but also to the species as a whole. For example, we know that biological improvement is not only a matter of improving the physique or alleviating pain, but of improving the species by selected matings. We could, by the compulsory union of desirable types and by the elimination of the unfit, improve mankind out of all recognition. Witness what we have already done with various breeds of animals. But although this biological improvement is highly desirable this stud farm approach to human betterment is abhorrent to the spiritual side of our nature. The desirability or otherwise of carrying out the recommendations of science, will have to be judged both from the biological and the spiritual angle.

The spiritual, or "We" side of man has to be treated differently. We are dealing not with material things, but with a part of man's being that is "something more" than what is necessary for individual survival and well-being. We are dealing with some fount of inspiration which urges the individual to self-sacrifice, urgings which transcend all the biological and survival laws of the individual.

It is this "fount of inspiration" that we call the soul. Although we cannot give it size or shape we know that it exists. We can observe its effects, and there cannot be effects without a cause. As the survival instincts of the individual and the urgings of the soul are antagonistic, and as it is reasonable to assume that nothing exists without a purpose, we may well ask, what is the function of the soul?

Religious mysticism tells us that the soul is an eternal spirit which, when not inhabiting mortal flesh, lives in an ethereal world of its own. But there is no evidence for this outside man's own passionate yearning to avoid the consequences of death. We know from history that the nature of the soul is not constant. It is subject to the same inherited and environmental influences that cause evolution in other parts of living organisms. We know that man, both physically and mentally, has evolved from some more primitive form of life, and we cannot escape the fact that the soul must have evolved with him. This is, or should be, ample proof that the soul cannot exist without the body to house it and the mind to give it consciousness.

When we study these self-sacrificing impulses that we get from the soul, we find that they are not concerned with abstract right and wrong, or with the well being of the lower animals. They are, in the last analysis, found to be directed entirely in favour of the human species.

These impulses can be roughly divided into two groups. The first, or lower, is concerned solely with the maintenance, and propagation of the species. The second, or higher, is that conscious urge the majority of us have towards betterment. The first seeks to maintain the evolutionary *status quo*. The second is progressive. Both groups are selfless, i.e. they rise above the interests of the "I," and are therefore what we define as "spiritual."

The effects of the lower spiritual impulses can best be seen in family life. Although the begetting and bearing of children is biological self-fulfilment on the part of individuals, the pre-natal and after birth care of the children, with all the sacrifices this entails on the parents,

is selfless. But it is not a spiritual or selfless quality of man only. It is common to both man and beast.

What distinguishes man from the animals is an appreciation of the higher spiritual impulses, i.e. those which urge him to rise to something higher in the evolutionary scale. These impulses are not instinctive in the sense that the propagation of the species is instinctive. To serve their purpose they have to be translated into action by deliberate and conscious beings who have freewill and the power to judge between what, in the sight of Creation, is progressive and what is not; in other words between good and evil.

All individuals, except a few who are spiritually lower than the beasts, receive the lower impulses and usually act upon them, but the degree of consciousness of the higher impulses is attained by any individual depends on the degree to which he is in tune with the purpose behind phenomena. We can recognize a higher "value" only to the extent that our conception of truth approaches Reality, in other words the more we know of physical and psychical phenomena the better we shall be able to judge what is or is not progressive in the sight of God.

As we believe, for reasons that we shall give in the next chapter, that the "We" is something more than a collection of "I's," we are drawn to the conclusion that the purpose of the higher impulses is to further the progress of the species as a species. What benefit the individual gets from the improvement of species is incidental, and not the primary aim of Creation.

No human sacrifice is made that has not for its ultimate object the benefit of mankind. A man may give his life for some "ideal," but when doing so, he believes, rightly

or wrongly, that the ideal itself is of human benefit. He may give his life for a dog, but although the race is the poorer for the loss of one of its units, it is more than compensated for by the example of self-sacrifice he has shewn. Jesus did not die on the cross for righteousness sake. Neither was his sacrifice made for the benefit of the Galilean fish that he helped to catch, and incidentally destroy, nor for the ass that he rode, nor for any other of God's living creatures. His death was the best known and supreme example of the individual sacrificing itself for the sake of its species. He lived as a man, and he died to save mankind.

Man is not alone in having a soul. If he and all living creatures have evolved from the same primitive organisms, the lower animals themselves must have souls, unless, that is, we are to believe that at some stage of evolution man was granted a soul ready made.

The soul like any other part of a living being is subject to evolution. In the lower animals it is less well developed than in man. Nevertheless it exists. Its effects can be seen in the herd instinct, the worker ants' sacrifice to its community, and in many other ways. These actions may be unconscious, the urgings of blind instinct, but they shew that the individual's impulse to sacrifice itself for the sake of its species, is there.

The self-sacrificing impulses we get from the soul are, except in the case of a few individuals, considerably weaker than those biological urgings that are concerned with the well-being of the individual, and, if man is to progress, the spiritual, or race side of him will have to be strengthened. The need for this has been apparent throughout the ages. It is the basis of all religious teachings. The puny strivings of the soul against the interest

of self may at times seem futile, but these strivings are the noblest manifestation of man's progress. They represent evolution in its highest form, the struggle to subordinate the "I" to the "We."

Although we have drawn a distinction between the soul and the rest of the human being, as representing the selfless and the selfish in man, we must not make the mistake of thinking that the one can exist without the other. Apart from those "influences" which the individual exerts over future generations (which we discussed in the chapter on immortality) there is no evidence that the soul or any other part of the human being survives the death of the body.

The soul cannot exist without mind. How can the self-sacrificing impulses which come from it be translated into good actions or have any meaning at all unless the individual concerned is conscious of them? If the soul did, or could, exist without mind it would be something impersonal for which the individual could have no responsibility.

The mind in turn depends on organic matter (the brain). When the brain is destroyed the mind and the personal spirit are destroyed with it. We know also that damage to the brain can have far reaching effects on the psyche. Not only can it make the mind less efficient, but it can also alter, and even destroy, the individual's sense of morality. Interference with the physical matter of the brain, can and very often does, have adverse repercussions on the soul.

Creation itself does not recognise any distinction between spirit and organic matter, and certainly does not favour the former at the expense of the latter. In fact evolution, which is creation at work, at times seems to

unfairly discriminate against the spiritually "good." It will leave and even encourage these bestial types who are robust physically, but it will have no mercy on the "saint" with a weak heart. God will not for long tolerate the spiritual in man unless it is accompanied by mental and physical fitness.

How then can we regard the individual as anything but one indivisible whole? The biological and the spiritual in him are interdependent. Whatever mysticism may say, the soul needs the body to house it and the mind to give it consciousness.

CHAPTER 11

THE SPECIES

As we have reason to believe that creation, with its subsequent evolution, is the design of the first cause, and as we find that that part of the psyche we call the soul was created for the purpose of furthering this evolution, both reason and extra-sensory perception draw us to the conclusion that in the sight of the Maker of all the human species is "something more," something infinitely greater, than the sum of its living parts.

In numbers the members of the human species are infinite. There are not only the present living members, but also the dead and the unborn. We cannot deny the fact that the primitive living cell from which all life sprang is just as much a member of the species as some human who has recently died. From both, and from the generations in between, we have inherited all the physical, mental, and spiritual characteristics—to say nothing of all the culture and civilization—that make us what we are to-day.

Neither can we deny membership to those who are yet to come, who exist among us only as living seed. We who have inherited and benefit from the experiences of past generations, both those which are inherent in ourselves and those which have been recorded for us, have a duty to pass on this accumulated knowledge to posterity. In God's scheme of evolution it is just as much the property of the unborn as it is of ourselves.

Of all the races of living creatures the human species is the highest in the evolutionary scale. It is the most complex, the most conscious of Reality, and the one with the greatest potentiality for change, for adapting itself to the course of evolution. This leads to what, to us, is the reasonable belief that it is the intention of the first cause that the human species—providing it is prepared to fight and adapt itself to changing circumstances—will continue in the forefront of evolution; that the evolutionary gap between it and the rest of the animal kingdom will become still wider; that it is the favourite child of creation, and the highest work of God.

The human species was not created in its present form by one act of creation. It is the product of evolution. Starting when life first appeared evolution has, through countless generations, slowly brought the original living substance to its present form, culminating in Man. As this evolutionary process has been going on for so long, we have no reason to suppose that it is now finished. There is no apparent limit to evolution either in time, or in the effects it can produce.

When we realize the immensity of the scale of evolution, and that it is the work of a timeless God, reason tells us that the present members of the species are no more than a passing phase in creation's scheme of things; that as lowlier forms of life have been discarded to make way for man, so will man in his present form eventually disappear to make way for some still higher form of life.

Physically, mentally, and spiritually man, as we know him to-day, is only a crude form of what it is intended he should be in the future. We, the present members of the species, are not the be all and end all of Creation. We are only a part, and a very minute part, of a greater

whole. In the life stream it is the species which is the entity, not the individual. We should liken the individual to some experimental growth, which, when it has served its purpose, is cast aside. The individual is only a temporary member of the species. He is mortal, whereas the species, unless some act of God himself destroys it, will last for all time.

That intuitive sense of right and wrong which we all possess, and which gives us our perception of moral values, is almost entirely directed towards improving the biological and spiritual characteristics of the species. What benefit accrues to the individual is incidental. "Do unto others as you would have them do to you" is a precept which, if followed, has survival and improvement value both for the individual and for the species, but when the motive behind it is the benefit of the individual it is selfish. If the higher values have any meaning for us at all, then "Do unto others as you would have them do to you" should be selfless, and the interests of the individual should take second place to those of the species.

If the human species is not something more than the sum of its parts, then creation itself is diabolically cruel, unjust, and immoral by any humanly conceived standard.

Children are born into this world of an "All-loving God" who have inherited from their forefathers defects which doom them to suffering. "And the sins of the fathers shall be visited on the children unto the third and fourth generation" is a statement of fact to which all that modern science can add is:—"And also unto the nth generation." It is a fact which no pious hopes can alter. Yet the children who suffer are innocent of any crime against creation.

The suffering of these innocents moreover, cannot be attributed entirely to the wrong doing of either the fathers, or the mothers. The "sins" for which they suffer are not necessarily syphilitic and the result of moral laxity. They may be, and very often are, due to a chance combination of inherited characteristics which is degenerate. A "sin" in the sight of creation is the possession of any physical, mental or spiritual defect which, however innocently acquired, can be passed on to posterity.

Neither can the possessor of any such defect be regarded as "immoral" if, when passing it on, he is unaware of the evil consequences of doing so. But he becomes hateful to creation itself and violates any conceivable code of ethics if he, knowing what may result, does so deliberately.

Making one individual suffer for the sins of another is an outrage against any religious, or other humane standard if we regard individuals as separate entities. It becomes understandable only if we accept as a fact that in the sight of God it is the species that matter and not the individual.

If it is the individual who is all important and not the species, then it is the Will of God that the innocent should suffer, and this makes nonsense of any conception of righteousness in the world. All those kindly, humane impulses which come from the soul, and which urge the individual to sacrifice itself for the sake of its species, are futile in the face of the Creative Will.

But if, as we have reason to believe, the Supreme Power regards the species as one then there are no "innocents." The species is one indivisible whole and is rewarded or punished as such. When a child is knocked down and mutilated by some motor vehicle, it is an "act of God" punishing, not the child as such, but the

species as a whole for a violation of the dynamic laws of creation.

This concept of the oneness of the species is difficult for us, with our traditional lines of thought, to grasp; but grasp it we must if we are to make sense out of the universe. If we cannot, then we never shall know what purpose lies behind phenomena. While the innocent suffer what other explanation can there be?

It is obvious, however, that as the species cannot exist without its transitory individuals the well-being of the individual as such is of vital concern to all. Self interest, providing it does not harm the well-being of others, is not a sin. Every man has a duty to make the best of himself. Even though he exists for so brief a time in this world he should be proud of the gifts creation has given him and realize that these gifts were intended to be used. If he neglects them he is belittling God's gifts. Without physical, mental, and spiritual fitness he is unable to play his part in the evolution of his fellow men. In the divine scheme of evolution he becomes a liability, not a working asset.

But however much it is the duty of the individual to better himself he must never forget that in the stress and turmoils of existence there will come times when he will have to obey the promptings of his soul and sacrifice his own interests for the sake of his species; when one "good" has to give way to what, in the sight of God, is a greater.

CHAPTER 12

HUMAN VARIETIES

EVOLUTION has caused the human species to divide into a number of different varieties. The differences between them can be seen in such physical traits as colour of skin, texture of hair, cast of features, and so on, and also in their different mental, and spiritual growths.

There are three main varieties: the white (Caucasian) yellow (Mongolian) and black (Negroid). In addition owing to overlapping and intermixture there are many sub-divisions of all shades of colour ranging from Nordic white, through yellow and brown to fuzzy black.

In spite of their differences, however, they are still varieties, not distinct species. Individuals of different varieties it should be remembered can mate, and produce fertile offspring, whereas individuals of different species cannot.

This differentiation must have been going on for countless generations. It has been accelerated when different groups have been isolated, and retarded when conditions allowed of freer intercourse. Up to the present it would appear that mankind has, on the whole, been differentiating, but now, owing to freer inter-communication between groups, it is more than likely that there will be a process of readmixture.

If conditions in the future allowed for differentiation to continue, the varieties of mankind would, under the

natural laws governing the universe, eventually become distinct species. They would divide into a number of streams which differ from each other as much as mankind now differs from the animal kingdom. These streams would be mutually antagonistic, and the human species would cease to be one brotherhood both biologically, and in the sight of its Maker.

It would appear then, that the evolution of varieties into species is not a "good." If we are to avoid the evil consequences of a divided race, and take a long term view of what is best for mankind, we should encourage readmixture.

Evolution, however, has brought the species to that stage when the development of varieties into species has become impossible. For conditions to become favourable to differentiation on this scale the species would have to be decimated, varieties isolated, and what was left of mankind would have to return biologically, and spiritually, to what it was milleniums ago. Only some cosmic catastrophe could turn the clock back to this extent.

Owing to the increase of world population varieties will, in the future, come more and more into contact, and this will inevitably lead to the varieties themselves disappearing. All the members of the species will become biologically, and spiritually more or less alike. There will, of course, be individual differences, but not to the same extent as at present. We should not have such contrasting types as a European professor and an Australian black boy.

The elimination of varieties may be brought about in two different ways. One is by the varieties themselves remaining distinct, and one of them, by being the best

adapted to prevailing conditions, ousting the rest. The other is by general inter-marriage.

Which method of bringing all human stock into uniformity is the better, is for us to decide. If we are to further the cause of evolution we cannot leave it to chance. From the evolutionary point of view there is too much at stake.

The easiest and probably the most popular way would be to leave it to inter-marriage. Uniformity would come much quicker, and with far less strife, than if we left it to varieties to fight for supremacy among themselves. Unfortunately the easiest way is not always the best. The study of evolution has convinced us that it is the will of creation that the fittest variety should predominate and supplant the others.

Readmixture would mean an averaging out of human biological and spiritual characteristics. It would lead to an evolutionary mean that was something higher than that of the less well developed varieties, but something less than that of the higher. We should get uniformity, but not a uniformity of the highest possible type. Human stock would become mongrelized.

On the other hand did varieties "fight it out" the conqueror would, of necessity, have to be the one most fitted to survive; that is, the one most favoured by creation. It would have to be the highest form of life yet known, one tested in the struggle, not only against the common hazards of life, but also against the competition of other varieties. It would have to be more in harmony with the design of the first cause than any untested mediocracy that could result from readmixture.

The laws of survival are laid down by the Creator himself and they apply to varieties as well as to indivi-

duals. However brutal they may appear to be, we should remember that it is only the operation of these laws which has brought the human species up from the primitive cell where all life began. At times it seems that these laws are concerned solely with biological uplift, and fail to develop man's spiritual characteristics. But if spiritual characteristics are those which best serve God's purpose, then the variety which overcomes all others must have these characteristics developed to a higher degree than those of its competitors. It must be the one which is following the evolutionary path which is the nearest to what is the will of the God of Creation.

The overwhelming by one variety of all others does not necessarily mean the latter's extermination by fire and sword. It is more likely to come about by one variety being more prolific than the others. No variety can hope to lead the species for long if it limits its birthrate below that of its rivals. Pressure of population inevitably leads to one variety encroaching on the living space of others.

The disappearance of varieties from whatever cause will mean a slowing down of the evolutionary process. Much of the competitive spirit which urges men onward will be lost. It is for this reason that in the interests of the species as a whole, varieties should be retained as long as possible.

Human progress, in both biological and spiritual spheres, depends on variety not only between individuals of the same variety, but also between the varieties themselves. Different varieties are following different evolutionary paths. Their physical, mental, and spiritual characteristics are being developed on different lines. This is why different varieties are not only producing different biological types, but are also giving us different

aspects of Reality, of the nature of the cause behind phenomena. Variety gives us far more channels to truth than uniformity.

Human progress is almost impossible without the evolutionary higher varieties. Without them it would be as if science, after losing its best brains, tried to make progress by all scientists following the same line of research, or as if art tried to reach the sublime if it had access to only one school of painting. Without diversity the world would be a much poorer place than it is.

All this does not mean that we should regard one variety as being permanently superior to another. At present the white race, being more aggressive and having a higher culture, is dominant. But this has not always been so, and there is no reason to think that white supremacy will continue indefinitely. Different varieties have, at different times, been in the forefront of evolution. The Chinese could have taught us much while we, the whites, were still barbarians and there is no apparent reason why the black races, with their awakening consciousness, should not take their turn at leadership. Varieties are not fundamentally different from each other. Although they are following different evolutionary paths they are all of the same human stock.

Nevertheless, in the interests of the species as a whole, the races should be kept physically separate. The dividing lines between them should not be horizontal with one variety dominating and exploiting another, but vertical to allow each variety to develop to its fullest extent in its own way. To make this possible no variety should be denied its fair share of the earth's natural resources.

There should be mutual help between varieties. It is in the interest of the more advanced races themselves

that they should further the evolution of the less fortunate, to say nothing of the benefit this uplift would confer on mankind as a whole. But above all there should be a free exchange of ideas and knowledge, to enable all varieties to benefit from the varied biological and spiritual experiences of the others.

The forbidding of mixed marriages should not be carried to extremes. There should not be too many vertical screens. Language, national, or geographical differences should be no bar to union. The offspring of say a white European with a South American of European descent are not degenerate as both parents are of the same, or very similar, biological and cultural stock.

The trouble arises when there is union between widely different types such as a European with some primitive black. The attraction between such opposing types is more often than not based on lust. It is a union of individuals with different inherited backgrounds and as a consequence there is seldom that cultural and spiritual harmony between them which makes for the complete happy marriage which is so essential for the moral well-being of children.

The children of such unions may not be inferior, either physically or mentally to the parent who is the higher in the evolutionary scale, but, and in spite of exceptions to the contrary, miscegenation has a pronounced tendency to bring out the worst characteristics of both races. The children inherit something of two widely different moral traditions; traditions which are irreconcilable and which inevitably lead to a neutralizing of the potential good inherent in both. This, in turn, leads to psychic disturbances, which can be seen in the anti-social attitude of many half-castes to both parent

races, and, owing to the loss of traditional taboos, in the low moral standards of many mixed peoples. The inferiority complex from which many half-castes suffer is not due to the contempt shewn to them by ill-natured members of the parent races; it is a spiritual disharmony which is the inevitable result of trying to instal two different inherited backgrounds into one human being.

In spite of the drawbacks with which they start out in life most peoples of mixed blood live a happy carefree life, which, to the humanists, is all that matters. But we, who maintain that it is the Will of God that the human species should rise to something greater than what it is, can only deplore the mixing of the higher and lower varieties. It is part of that mongrelizing process which leads to the disappearance of varieties, and as a consequence the loss of that benefit we get from different evolutionary experiments.

Although varieties are essential to human progress we have to beware of in-breeding, which is as bad biologically as is the mixing of widely different types spiritually. Fortunately, expanding human life and the institution of taboos against incest, have caused the species to avoid the worst effects of consanguinity although traces of deterioration can be seen in tribes which have been isolated for generations, and in some country villages belonging to even the more advanced races.

It does seem that creation intended human blood to be "pure," but not quite. We should liken the qualities we need from mixed, or any other marriage, to those we need from water. Pure water is insipid; mixed with too much foreign matter it is undrinkable. It is potable water that we need; pure water with just enough foreign matter in it to give it a sparkle.

Owing to the ease with which races can now intermingle the problems of mixed marriages is coming increasingly to the fore. It is not only raising biological and cultural difficulties; it is having moral and political repercussions.

Current religious and democratic opinion, believing that all men are equal is against any "colour bar." The holders of these opinions would have us treat the coloured people with whom we come into contact as equals and without discrimination. They would have us take them into our homes and not debar them from any social intercourse with our own people. They claim, quite rightly, that social intercourse will help to remove misunderstandings and promote friendship between peoples, a friendship which from any humanitarian standpoint is a desirable end in itself.

But there cannot be complete social intercourse on an equality basis without inter-marriage. To encourage, say, some coloured student to mix freely with white people and then to deny him the opportunity of marrying into the white race if he so desires, is to raise the colour bar in its most acute and aggravating form. Rather than do this it would be better if social intercourse were forbidden from the start.

The problem of mixed marriages bristles with difficulties. To find a "just" solution we have to bring both our extra-sensory, and our sensory perceptions, into play. We all have an intuitive urge towards kindness and friendship which makes us want to pull down all barriers between peoples. But extra-sensory insight cannot be a revelation of what is the Will of God if it does not fit the facts of creation, and we know both from observation and reason, of inevitable evolutionary retrogression

that would take place did varieties disappear. Neither should we, whether our skins be black or white, suppress that instinct which urges every living creature to mate with its own kind.

Let us be friends with the more backward varieties with all the means in our power that are consistent with human progress. Let us, by furthering their education and giving them the benefit of all white experiences help them to improve their standards of life and culture. Let us respect them. Although at present they look to us for guidance time may yet prove that the evolutionary path they are following is better than ours. But in the meantime social intercourse between varieties will have to be limited. In the interests of the species as a whole somewhere between friendliness and inter-marriage it is inevitable that some form of vertical colour bar will have to be raised.

CHAPTER 13

INEQUALITY

THE primary purpose of creation is to raise the human species both biologically and spiritually into something greater than it is, but this does not mean that the individuals who make up the species are either biologically, or spiritually equal, or even have equal rights.

No two individuals are alike. Some are in the forefront of evolution biologically, while others have made more progress spiritually. One who is at the top of the evolutionary tree both biologically and spiritually is a rarity.

Below these higher types we have the vast bulk of mankind, the individuals of which have the biological, and the spiritual developed in them in varying degrees, until we get down to the biological misfits, and those who are spiritually little better than the beasts. There are as many combinations of the biological and spiritual in mankind as there are members of the species, whether these members are living, dead, or yet to be born.

This differentiation is the work of evolution. It has already brought us higher in the evolutionary scale than other forms of life but it is not yet content. To further the design of the first cause it is still culling out and picking over the individuals of the species just as it did when our ancestors were blobs of living protoplasm. It selects those which serve its purpose, and rejects those which do not.

People who have been brought up with humane ideals find this inequality difficult to appreciate. Why, they ask, should creation have made some men physically nearly perfect, some mentally deranged, and others spiritually blessed? Why should the advantages and disadvantages of life have been so unequally distributed? The lack of biological and spiritual parity between man and man cannot be due to the faults or virtues of the individuals concerned. They were born that way.

We shall understand the creative purpose behind phenomena only when we realize that in the sight of God the species is something more than the sum of its living parts. Evolution is not concerned with what we call "justice" to the individual, but with the progress of the species as a whole. Then it will be found that the inequality between man and man is a necessary part of the divine scheme of things. Some individuals have more evolutionary value than others.

The progress of the human species, whether it be in biological and spiritual characteristics, science, art, or in any other field which leads man to a higher life, is not made by the lowly in spirit, the physically and mentally unfit, or by the spiritually debased. It is brought about by those individuals who, in one way or another, are at the top of the evolutionary tree; who have their physical, mental and spiritual characteristics developed to such an extent that in the particular sphere in which they excel they dominate their environment. The children of the physical superman are more likely to survive than those of the physically unfit; the mentally alert more easily escape the dangers of existence than the sluggish; and it is the spiritual "saint," and not the ordinary believer, who has been, and still is, responsible

for mankind's spiritual progress. If all men were equal, that is if all the higher and lower characteristics were evenly distributed, mankind would be reduced to one mediocre mass, and all the more progressive biological and spiritual elements which make for human progress would be lost.

If it is to fulfil its destiny mankind needs leadership to guide it along the evolutionary path, and if this path is to be the right one the higher types have the added duty of becoming the pathfinders. We know from history that it is only when the higher types have been in the ascendancy that mankind has made progress. Leadership does not necessarily mean a biological, or spiritual, dictatorship. The influences of the more progressive can be far more subtle. Witness the profound spiritual influence of the great religious reformers, the power over nature given to us by such a mentally higher type as Newton, or the cultural effect on mankind of Shakespeare.

Nevertheless there are times when in the interests of the species as a whole the higher types have to dominate and even exploit the lower. This may seem wrong by the generally accepted moral standard, but it is not so by that of creation. It is the working of that natural law which is forever giving preference to the fittest. However much we dislike this law, in practice we have to abide by it.

When we choose a mate we choose our ideal partner, not someone who to us is physically, or mentally, or spiritually repulsive. We never offer the higher posts in the State, the Church, or in any other sphere where we need the best, to the physically, or mentally, or spiritually unfit. When we have a limited number of places in our higher educational establishments to fill, we fill them

with those students who are the best equipped mentally to profit by advanced studies, and not by morons. We follow creation's natural law, and choose the fittest. How is it possible for us to do otherwise?

If, to satisfy some man-made code of ethics, we put the lower types on an equal footing with the higher, we should be acting both against reason and our intuitive and instinctive knowledge of the creative purpose. Mankind would not only cease to advance, it would degenerate both biologically and spiritually. We shall never know what is the design of the first cause if we shut our eyes to the facts of creation. We cannot escape the laws of God. They transcend all the ethical codes of mankind. Inequality both of biological and spiritual characteristics, and of opportunity, is part of the price we have to pay for progress. God is no egalitarian.

CHAPTER 14

THE WILL TO POWER

THE higher qualities of mankind have no evolutionary value without aggressiveness. It is the negation of the evolutionary urge for a saint to retire to his hermit's cave and leave mankind to its own devices; for the artist to hide his light under a bushel; the scientist to keep the results of his mental jugglery to himself, or for any of the higher types to die childless. There can be no progress if the finer qualities remain dormant or die out. The evolutionary value of the higher types is in proportion to the strength of the impact they have on the species.

Fortunately, to overcome inertia, creation implanted in us, and in all other living creatures, a driving force which we call the will to power. All individuals have it, but it is stronger in some than in others. We all know those pugnacious, purposeful individuals of strong character who, by sheer force of personality, dominate their surroundings. They have the aggressive spirit developed in them to a high degree. For better or worse they are the people who get things done.

The will to power should not be condemned offhand. Although it is egoistical in character it is a necessity for survival and progress. It is a vital urge not only to master the dangers of one's environment, but to change that environment. It is the driving force behind evolution.

This dynamic, the will to power, is ethically neutral. It may throw up a Tamerlane whose hobby is the counting of skulls, or some mystic, who, believing he has a divine message to convey, imposes his convictions on mankind. It is found in the conqueror and the saint; the gangster and the prelate; and in the intriguing politician as well as in the scientific humanist. It may have caused much misery to mankind, but at the same time it has done much good. Is not righteous indignation an expression of the will to power to overcome evil? And did not Jesus exercise this power when he threw the money changers out of the Temple?

There can be no doubt that the will to power has furthered the cause of evolution far more than it has retarded it. It may have had appalling results for those individuals who have been its victims, but, as the study of creation has convinced us that the species is something more than the sum of its parts, we have to judge the will to power by its effects, not on the individual, but on the species as a whole. From this viewpoint it will be found from history that it has been of the greatest benefit to mankind.

There could have been no expansion of human life either numerically or geographically without aggression. Take the will to power of Caesar which was the driving force behind the conquest of Britain. To the native Britons at the time this conquest was a disaster of the first magnitude; many of them lost their lives, and the rest were enslaved. But as conditions settled down it was found that the conquest had improved the lot of the conquered. The Romans, by imposing their laws on the local warring tribes, and by introducing a higher civilization and culture into the country, had considerably

improved the prospects of survival and betterment of the native population. Caesar may not have realized it, but his will to power was working for evolution.

There would have been no United States of America without the pugnacious will to power of those pioneers who fought the red man and robbed him of his hunting-grounds. These virile invaders had no legal or "moral" right to take this land by force, but who now will say that they were in the wrong? Had it not been for them what would have become of the surplus people of Europe? Without the invasion of the American continent millions of them would never have had the chance to be born. There would not have been living room for them in their countries of origin. Those robust pioneers fought their way westward, not for Christian or other ethical reasons, but to meet the needs of evolution.

The will to power is found not only in individuals but also in groups or races. This group aggressiveness is different in kind from the will to power of the individual. It is the same evolutionary urge which, although still tribal or nationalistic, transcends the needs and desires of the individual. It is an evolutionary step upwards which is essentially spiritual. The individual has, of necessity, to accept discipline from, and subordinate himself to, the needs of his group. He has to sacrifice himself for the sake of something greater than the personal "I."

Group aggressiveness, or the urge for one group to dominate others, has been the cause of all wars, and for this reason all religions, and all humane idealists, have combined to condemn it. But war in spite of its destructiveness has been an essential part of the creative evolutionary process. By forcing the contestants to exert

themselves physically and mentally to the utmost, and by demanding from many the supreme sacrifice it has strengthened those physical, mental and spiritual characteristics which are so important to human progress. What would our qualities of courage and resourcefulness be like if they were never put to the test? And how could the soul itself find expression if the need for self-sacrifice never arose? To say that these desirable qualities can be exercised in other ways than by war is true of the exceptional few, but it is only the compulsion of disaster that stirs the lethargic many. In the midst of war, and for some years afterwards, we see the evil side of it. We see it in a true perspective only after a lapse of time, when we are able to judge it historically and in its effects on human progress.

War has had a good effect on the human species not only qualitatively but quantitatively. Although there are usually less living individuals at the end of a war than there were at the beginning, the long term effect of a war has meant a numerical increase. As we have seen from the conquest of Britain, and the over-running of the American continent, group aggression, by the widening of mental horizons, the opening up of more of the earth's surface for human exploitation, and the spreading of higher standards of living has made it possible for human life to expand. Without group aggression it is doubtful whether human society would ever have been anything more than a few isolated and wandering tribes.

Although war has in the past, and on balance, favoured human progress, we have to recognise that evolutionary progress, which means changing circumstances, has caused war to become an unmitigated evil. The diabolical power of modern weapons is now so great that the ill effects of war far outweigh the good.

It does seem that mankind needs its wars in moderation. Up to the end of the nineteenth century, war on the whole seems to have been progressive. It was limited in its effects and not total in the modern sense. Modern war, however, with its indiscriminate destruction, has lost its evolutionary value. It does not favour the fittest, or any group. It destroys all. It has got to that stage when in its destructiveness it is liable to lead to the point of no recovery.

Both individual and group aggression have, at different times, and in different places, served the cause of humanity, but the time has now come when, if man is to make further progress, or even to survive, both these aspects of the will to power will have to be curbed. They should not be abolished even if this were possible. Man's natural pugnacity is one of his greatest assets.

The spiritual evolution of man although it has not, and is not, likely to bring about any diminution in the individual's will to power, has caused it to be directed more and more in favour of the group; a process which probably reached its peak in the patriotism of the nineteenth century. But this is not enough. If man is to keep in harmony with what both reason and extra-sensory perception tell us is the design of the first cause, both the individual and the group will to power, will have to be subordinated to the combined will to power of the species as a whole.

CHAPTER 15

THE UNITY OF CREATION

THE primal law of creation is the "survival of the fittest." Both inorganic and organic matter are governed by it. We see it operating in the destruction of a light body when it comes into collision with a heavy one, as well as in the red claws of the jungle. It shews itself in the competition between the different species, varieties and individuals into which all organic matter is divided. We cannot escape it.

The fittest organisms under this law are not necessarily those with the highest spiritual qualities. They are those species, varieties and individuals who can best adapt themselves biologically to their environment, and who have those fighting qualities which are essential for overcoming the hazards of life, and the opposition of other organisms. The only spiritual qualities necessary for survival are those which are concerned with the continuity of species, and the only weakness tolerated under this law, is the weakness of immaturity. The children of the strong have to be nurtured so that they, in turn, may become the strong. All the higher spiritual values, those which seek to improve species, are ignored under this primal law.

This law may seem brutal to us, but a little thought will shew us how necessary it is. It is obvious that much life has to be destroyed. There is not enough room on

this planet for all the potential life that is clamouring to live on it, and, if some has to go, is it not common sense that it should be the unfit, namely that which is defective in the sight of creation? No species could maintain its position in the scale of evolution, let alone improve it, if the biologically strong were sacrificed for the sake of the biologically weak. Did creation favour the biologically unfit we know that life would degenerate, and, as we have seen that the spiritual is dependent on the physical and mental, all the higher spiritual characteristics which extra-sensory perception urges us to develop, would gradually die out.

To modern idealism the law which lays down that the fittest shall survive seems somehow evil. We have got so used to the idea that "right" means helping the cause of the under-dog and helping the unfit to survive, that we have blinded ourselves to the harsh facts of creation. We have got to realize that the laws which govern the universe were not laid down by some benign patriarch. They are the dictates of an unknowable first cause, and, if we are to keep in harmony with this cause, we shall have to obey its rules.

We are not responsible for creation. We have to take it as we find it. It is obvious from all that goes on around us that the Creator intended the fitter to supplant the weaker, and if our concept of what is right is different to that of the Creator, then it is we who are wrong. The survival of the fittest is a natural law, an inevitable one if we take into account how the universe is made, and a law which must be in the sight of creation a "righteous" law. God prefers the strong to the weak.

But the survival of the fittest is not the whole of the purpose behind phenomena. This serves only to

maintain the species in its current stage of evolution; its object is biological continuity, and stability. It has no progressive value.

Yet it is obvious from the study of fossils, of biological changes, and of human relationships that creation intended life to progress, and as the biological instincts do not supply any incentive to progress we have to look to psychical phenomena to account for that evolutionary urge which makes us all want to better ourselves.

The soul (as we have defined it) is that part of the psyche from which "selfless" impulses emanate. It is that "fount of inspiration" which makes us aware of something greater than the personal "I," and for the sake of which it demands self-sacrifice. To satisfy itself it needs something to reverence, to idealise, something higher than the individual to which it belongs. This selfless idealism shews itself in many human activities, but whatever form it takes it will be found, for reasons that we have already given, that the ultimate object of it is the physical, or mental, or spiritual uplift of the human species.

Selfless idealism, the urge to improve the lot of man, cannot be "explained" by reason. As human betterment is connected in our consciousness with the designs of an unknowable first cause, we cannot know *why* it is the will of this cause that the human species should be bettered. For this reason selfless idealism partakes of the supernatural. Whether the soul's activities are directed towards biological improvement, towards the promotion of human happiness through social service, or are concerned the spiritual uplift of religion, they have no "rational" basis. Devotion to the uplift of man, whatever form it takes, is mystical.

Although the ultimate question "Why should the human species seek to improve itself" cannot be answered, both sensory and extra-sensory perception tell us that betterment is part of the divine purpose. We have only to compare the biological differences between the amoeba and man, and the spiritual differences between brute instincts and man's preoccupation with higher values, to know of the upward changes that have taken place. Most of these changes, it should be remembered, were brought about by the natural laws of God, and eons before man was even conscious of evolution, let alone in a position to deliberately affect it. The universal belief that it is the will of God that the human species should rise to something greater than it is cannot be "proved," but it is a proposition that has both biological and spiritual evidence to support it. To this extent it is a "rational" belief.

We have then two different aspects of creation. On the one hand the brutal mechanistic non-progressive laws of survival, and on the other those kindly, spiritual impulses that make for human progress. However incompatible they may seem they are both part of the one reality.

The apparent contradiction between the brutality and the kindness of creation has been the cause of most of our misunderstandings of what lies behind phenomena. Either we have accepted the view that creation is material and mechanistic, and that our perception of good and evil is, in some way or other, an extension of the knowledge we get from the instinct of self-preservation, or we have gone to the other extreme, and visualized the universe as the work of an all-loving God and left Him to reveal, in His own good time, the solution of the

problem of evil. The former view is, in general, the scientific, the latter the theological.

But to us who try to see creation as a whole, both these concepts of reality are wrong if taken separately. We have to accept creation as something which is at the same time both brutal and kindly, ugly and beautiful. We cannot approach truth by shutting our eyes to either. There is an essential unity about creation which is indifferent to both science and theology.

As we have seen that the individual is a unity of flesh and spirit, and the human species an entity in its own right, so we see the brutality of the survival laws and the kindness of extra-sensory perception as the two sides of the one coin. Both are working for the same end, the evolution of the human species. The one is to safeguard its very existence, the other to improve it. And is this not a logical view to take? If we have the one Creator, then all phenomena must be part of the one design. The bloody laws of survival and the kindness of the higher soul are both manifestations of the one God.

What the first cause of all things intends us to become eventually we cannot know, but if we combine sensory experience with extra-sensory perception we can know what path it is intended that we should take. As individuals, varieties, and species we shall have to be brutally hard to keep on this path, but at the same time, if we are to travel along it, we shall have to obey the "voice of conscience" and sacrifice, when necessary, our own personal interests to further the progress of that greater whole, the human species. We shall have to follow the example of that noble personality of whom it is written "He died to save mankind."

CHAPTER 16

GOOD AND EVIL

THE existence of evil is the great enigma of life. Its presence has troubled the faithful down through the ages and continues to do so. Many devout religious people cannot reconcile evil with their conception of the Creator as a benevolent deity. Many go so far as to say that evil is not the work of God, but is something which has always existed. If this were true, a monotheistic view of the universe would be untenable. It would mean that some evil force exists which is eternal and co-existent with God, and which is working against Him.

But belief that a good and an evil spirit exist which are eternally striving for mastery finds no support from reason. Good and evil are abstractions. They have meaning only in reference to something real. Except in thought there could not have been anything either good or evil before creation. Good and evil cannot exist in a vacuum. It follows that if good and evil are qualities of created things, they must have come into existence with creation itself. However much the devout may passionately want to believe otherwise the existence of both good and evil things is the direct responsibility of the one God.

Good and evil are qualities of phenomena but these qualities in themselves are negative. They become

"real," that is have a good or evil effect only in relation to something else. A cancerous growth is not evil in itself; it becomes so only in its effect on a living body. A good action is good only in so far as it furthers the cause of some ideal. No actions or things can be either good, or evil, in themselves. They become one or the other only in their effect on some "desired end." Righteousness for its own sake does not make sense.

It follows that we cannot say what is good or what is evil without reference to this desired end to provide us with a yard-stick or scale of values. How we get this scale and by whom or what it is laid down are obviously matters of the greatest importance. If we are to judge aright we need to use the right scale.

Opinions as to what is good and evil vary so much that there must be more than one scale of values in use. Every individual appears to have his own. Many get theirs from the ethical teachings of their own religion, and, like the religion itself their acceptance of it is an "act of faith." Their scale of values is laid down for them by the current beliefs of their time and place; by their cultural and spiritual upbringing. But in spite of what revelation may have revealed to the different founders of different religions, logic tells that if we believe in the one supreme God there can only be one scale, and that is the one laid down by the Creator himself. Many theologians accept this view but as they still differ about what they believe this scale to be, we, who are seeking guidance, are thrown back on our own interpretation of what is the will of God.

We who believe that the primary design of the first cause is the physical, mental, and spiritual uplift of the human species have only one measuring rod, and that is

the one by which we measure human progress. To us good is that which furthers evolution, evil that which retards it. Our scale of values is the one which both reason and extra-sensory perception tell us is the one laid down by God Himself.

It does seem strange that the one God, the sole Creator of all should have brought into existence evil things, that is, things that are apparently working against His own creative purpose. When we see all the pain and suffering that exist we may well ask "Why does God allow it?" As the maker of all He is responsible. But it is not for us to criticize creation. Evil things exist by the will of God and He, as the supreme power and first cause of all, cannot be wrong.

Theologians have made many ingenious attempts to explain away the presence of evil but without success. They never will be able to reconcile evil with their conception of the Creator as an all-loving Father. They see God not as He is, but through a veil of mysticism. They see only one aspect of Him, not the greater and, at times, brutal whole. The supreme power is not governed by man-made scales of morality. He is a law unto Himself. The great work of creation with its attendant pain and suffering goes on sublimely indifferent to the protests of organized religion.

The riddle of evil becomes understandable only if we accept the fact that the main purpose of creation, to which all else is subordinate, is the physical, mental, and spiritual evolution of the human species. Then it will be found that evil has evolutionary value.

Good and evil are opposing values. One is meaningless without the other with which to compare it. The Creator made us in such a way that we cannot know hot

without knowing cold. We cannot have pleasure in freedom from pain without having experienced pain. We cannot have physical and spiritual well-being, without physical and spiritual sickness, nor happiness without its opposite sorrow.

When studying the problem of evil we should never forget that it is not the purpose of evolution to make us into perfected biological mechanisms only, but also into sentient beings, gifted with freewill and powers to judge between good and evil. Yet the paradox of it is that we are made in such a way that neither the physical nor the spiritual sides of us can make progress without physical and spiritual opposition.

It is in the light of these facts that we need a re-appraisal of what we mean by good and evil. As it is reasonable to suppose that it is God's intention to look after His own creation we should regard evil as something that serves His purpose, something which He has deliberately placed in our path as an obstacle to be overcome. We know from physiology, psychology and history that any part of our being whether physical, mental or spiritual, will wither and eventually die, if not used, and that the struggle to overcome physical, mental, and spiritual obstacles will benefit us far more than if these obstacles never existed. Strife against "evil" things is part of our disciplinary training for higher things. Life was not made to take things easily. It needs continuous strife to bring out the best in it. In a "sinless" world life would degenerate.

Why God should have created the universe in such a way that evil is a necessity we do not know, but before we condemn Him as unrighteous we should remember that it is only when using the creative gifts He has given

us to the full, in the fight to overcome obstacles, that man can achieve his greatest happiness.

As the progress of evolution is the "desired end" by which we measure good and evil, and as evolution inevitably means changing circumstances, we cannot regard any action, or thing, as being permanently good or evil, except of course our over-riding duty to evolution itself. A good is not necessarily a good for all times and places. For example, the institution of slavery was deemed to be right in ancient Greece. Aristotle, whom we cannot regard as an evil man, looked on it as the natural order of things and, if we take into consideration the conditions prevailing at the time, no doubt he was right. Life in those more primitive days was harder than it is to-day. It was more difficult to wrest a living from the soil and without the organized compulsion of slavery there would have been chaos. Slavery was a necessity for survival not only for the masters but for the slaves themselves. We should also remember that without this slavery which gave leisure to some very gifted men we should never have inherited all the beauty and culture this leisure gave them the chance to create. Slavery is not a good to-day. With the growth of science and the replacement of human muscle by machines the struggle for existence is not so acute. We are able now to uphold the dignity of man and to be more tolerant and humane. We can afford it.

A good is not necessarily associated with truth. A man may be devoted to some religion or ideal which gives him a totally wrong impression of what lies behind phenomena. But the devotion itself is a good. It gives the devotee that sheet anchor so necessary for his spiritual well-being and the stamina and moral fibre with which to withstand the vicissitudes of life.

There are degrees of goodness. What contributes to the progress of the individual as such is a good, but the sacrificing of this good for the sake of that living stream of life, the human species, is a greater. The one is selfish, the other selfless.

The never-ending clash between good and evil is evolution at work. From out of the struggle Man will rise to still greater heights. But we should not imagine that sometime in the distant future the human species will find eternal peace. The individual may find a temporary Nirvana in this world, but the only eternal peace for the species is that of oblivion. There is no evidence of any time limit to evolution.

The conflict between good and evil is a conflict between the divine evolutionary urge to rise, and the conservative physical and spiritual elements of tradition; between an intuitive appreciation of the higher values, and the sensual reactionary desires of the flesh; between the voice of conscience, and brute instincts. It is a conflict which will never end. Evil things will always be with us, and strife against them is the natural order of things.

When we overcome one evil we create others. Science has done much to eliminate such diseases as tuberculosis and the plague, but it has increased our potential for evil by inventing the atom bomb. Revelation, with the help of religious teachings is making us more humane, both in our dealings with our fellow men and with the lower animals, but at the same time it is making us more sensitive and thereby increasing our capacity to suffer.

Even if the conflict between good and evil could be resolved it could never be settled entirely in favour of one or the other. If we obeyed survival laws and ignored conscience we should descend to the level of the beasts;

if we carried out the dictates of conscience we should never destroy life. Even the rat which carries the plague would be sacred.

What we regard as evil is not "wrong" in the sight of God. He would not have created it otherwise. Evil is a necessary ingredient of human progress.

CHAPTER 17

RIVAL “GOODS”

ALTHOUGH “good” is that which furthers the evolution of man in both his spiritual and biological aspects, we have to recognize that what may be good for man spiritually may be bad for him biologically, and *vice versa*. Extreme asceticism may, or may not, be good spiritually, but it is obviously bad biologically. The cultivation of the body may be good biologically, but if carried to extremes it leaves no time for the consideration of ethical values, and is bad spiritually. We come up against the evolutionary claims of the spirit and the flesh. The question then arises which should have precedence?

Religion tells us that the spirit is all important; materialism that our sole concern should be with the body. But we who see man’s being as one physical, mental and spiritual whole, when trying to judge between these “rival goods” can give preference only to the one that seems to us at the time to be most in need of encouragement. At times it may be the spiritual side that is the more in need of help, at others the biological, but at no time should we try to further the one at the expense of the other.

There can be no doubt that at present the evolution of the spiritual side of man’s being has lagged behind the biological. This can be seen in the recurrent wars

between different sections of humanity, and in the ill will very often shewn by one individual to another. In many ways we are spiritually little removed from the animal kingdom.

This spiritual backwardness is mainly due to the comparatively short period of time that man has been making spiritual progress, compared with the eons that have gone to make him what he is biologically. Spiritual development is a recent phenomena, whereas biological evolution must have been going on since the beginning of life.

It is extremely doubtful whether man was even conscious of spiritual matters say 50,000 years ago. The urge to perpetuate and improve the species must have been there, since it is in all living creatures, but it could not have been the conscious and deliberate discrimination between good and evil which we consider spiritual to-day.

For countless generations before that primitive man and his even more primitive ancestors must have been aware of their bodily needs, and must have tried to satisfy them. In their struggle for survival they must have been more concerned with improving their prowess as hunters, than with metaphysical speculations. It is only when life became more settled, say at the dawn of agriculture, when notice had to be taken of the seasons and other phenomena, that man would become conscious of something over and above animal needs.

Spiritual conditions are not so stable as biological ones. Could conditions revert back to what they were 50,000 years ago it would take many generations for man to readjust himself biologically, but, as we have seen during modern wars, spiritually he can revert back almost overnight.

But fortunately for us, after a crisis which has aroused primitive passions has passed, those spiritual characteristics which we had developed before, reassert themselves. We do not have to wait for another 50,000 years of evolution before we are spiritually back where we were. Spiritual development, although not so stable, or so obvious, as biological, is nevertheless part of the human make-up.

Man has been conscious of his spiritual backwardness for thousands of years and many religions have grown up in an endeavour to remedy this defect. We may not agree that much of what these religions have taught has been spiritually good, but the emphasis that they have placed on spiritual development has, in the main, been consistent with the needs of evolution up to, and including, the present.

But spiritual development is not the whole of creation's purpose, and it is conceivable that if spiritual development continued at a faster rate than physical and mental, a time would come when the human species, by being predominantly spiritual, would be as ill-balanced in the one way as it is now in the other.

An example of spiritual overgrowth can already be seen in priestly celibacy, a celibacy which is deliberate and not due to unfortunate circumstances outside the control of the individual. It is claimed that celibacy frees the man of God from the mundane affairs and passions of life and leaves him free to concentrate on the spiritual well-being of his flock. But to us celibacy is the denial of the elementary right of some living seed of the life stream to germinate and become one of God's physical and spiritual beings. Celibacy by individuals who are biologically sound cannot be justified on either biological

or spiritual grounds. It is an unnatural, and therefore as contrary to the will of God, as is the contemplation of one's big toe from a bed of nails.

There are times when it seems that God speaks to us with two conflicting voices, and when trying to judge between biological and spiritual good the greatest difficulty we have is to reconcile them. Both brute instinct and conscience are the authentic voice of the one God.

It is obvious that we cannot ignore survival laws. It has been divinely ordained that all forms of life have to prey on each other in order to live. They cannot help themselves. They have to kill or be killed.

The stark necessity to kill would be a grim sadistic business if we did not have guidance on how it should be done. The voice of God, through conscience, tells us never to kill unless it is necessary for our own survival, and that when the necessity does arise we should do so in as humane a manner as possible. Pain and suffering are abhorrent to God especially when inflicted on some form of life whose only "crime" is that it serves man's purpose better dead than alive.

If it is God's purpose that we should progress then the conflict between the brute in us and conscience is one of the obstacles placed in our path for our own good. With freewill and the powers to form independent judgment that have been granted us, we have been given the task of finding a solution for ourselves.

The only solution that can be "right," that is, in accordance with the design of the first cause, is a compromise between the needs of the spirit and those of the flesh. We need to use both our intuitive and our reasoning powers to strike a balance between them. Both biological

and spiritual improvement are "goods" but the one cannot take place without the other. The purpose of creation is not to make either spiritual, or biological monstrosities, but well-balanced human beings.

When we have to choose between the evolutionary needs of the spirit and those of the flesh, we shall need all the moral courage we can muster. For example, we know that under natural laws the unfit are eliminated and the more robust left to carry on the species, but under modern conditions the opposite is taking place. The growth of medical science is enabling defective children not only to avoid a premature death, but to grow up to maturity and reproduce themselves. This, any animal breeder knows, leads to physical degeneration.

But conscience is against the elimination of these unfortunates. The only possible way to satisfy conscience and at the same time stop physical degeneration is to sterilize those of the unfit whom we know, and know beyond any shadow of doubt, can pass on traits which have an evil effect on posterity. We should give the unfit all the care in our power to help them to live happy and useful lives, but if we allow them to reproduce we are increasing the sum total of pain and suffering in the world, and thereby retarding the course of evolution.

When we come to make codes of conduct to guide us in everyday life we have not only to judge between the needs of the spirit and those of the flesh, we are also up against the difficulty of laying down fixed laws to meet the needs of a changing world. What is "right" in some circumstances may be wrong in others. No dogma can indefinitely meet current needs. Man is ever rising to greater heights and any laws we make will have to be sufficiently elastic to follow him in his upward progress.

There is one eternal "good" and one only, that is to help that physical and spiritual being we know as Man to rise to something greater than he is. Whatever is right or wrong, good or evil, at any time or place is that which furthers or retards this end.

CHAPTER 18

OUR “BELIEFS” AND WHAT THEY IMPLY

WE have tried to see the universe objectively and not as our inherited background tells us it ought to be. It is said, and with good reason, that we create God, or whatever else we believe to lie behind phenomena, in our own image; that God is something the mind itself has fashioned out of what seems to be universal chaos; that we all have a psychological tendency to visualize the unknown, not as it necessarily is, but as we passionately want it to be. This tendency we have tried to avoid. We have done our best to rid ourselves of pre-conceived notions of God, and by studying the universe He created, have tried to deduce the nature of the cause from its effects.

Our study of the universe, which we know to be far from comprehensive, has drawn us to certain conclusions the truth of which we cannot “prove” but which we “believe” to be true. These we should like to summarise.

1. We believe that there is an unknowable first cause which we call God.
2. That as eternity has no meaning for us, we have to accept this first cause as the Creator of all phenomena.
3. That it is the Creator who is causing the composition of the physical and psychical universe to change.

4. That the Creator is working to a design, and that all the ambiguities in the universe, the evil as well as the good, are all parts of this one design.

5. That we, as the only form of life which is conscious of morality, have a duty to conform to, and help to further this design.

6. That in spite of the apparent insignificance of this planet in the cosmic scale, the main purpose of Creation is the biological and spiritual development of the human species.

7. That there is no after life and consequently no heaven or hell.

How these "beliefs" of ours originated we do not know. They were born of extra-sensory perception, and as extra-sensory perception bypasses sense experience they are not strictly rational. They come to us from the shrouds of mysticism, in a form of revelation.

But as we have seen, revelation, in itself, is not a sure enough guide to truth. Our "beliefs" have to pass the test of observation, and reason. This we are convinced they can do, and for reasons we have given in previous chapters when discussing them. They are not based on E.S.P. alone. They take into account the observed facts of both physical and psychical phenomena. We cannot know the unknowable, but we can know from sense experience what is happening in the universe. To us our "beliefs" are facts about the universe, on which sensory and extra-sensory perception agree, and are therefore as near an approach to ultimate truth as it is possible to get.

These sensory/extra-sensory, rational/irrational facts of ours are, to us, the fundamental truths behind phenomena. Our belief in them is consistent with all we know, with the physical laws of nature as well as with spiritual

impulses. They are ultimate "goods," goods, that is, in their own right, and not goods which are only good for some higher good. They are the "facts" on which we base our whole philosophy.

As our fundamental truths originate in that void which is forever beyond the reach of the human intellect, no scientific discovery can invalidate or even modify them. Science may find that the basic particles of electricity of which the universe is (at present) composed can be subdivided into something still more ethereal. It may solve the problem of expanding life by making it possible for the human species to inhabit the planets and other astral bodies. There is no apparent limit to what human ingenuity may yet achieve. But however far science may travel it can never discover all. As scientific knowledge expands, the first cause of all things recedes still further into the void. In the nature of things we can never know what this first cause is.

Although our truths are, at least in part irrational, the application of them to human conduct has, of necessity, to be guided by what we know from observation and reason. They give us a guidance which is general, but not detailed. If we always bear them in mind we cannot go far wrong, but to meet the prosaic, ever-changing needs of everyday life we have to take into account the circumstances prevailing at the time. We have to use our own "common sense" to tell us what is, or is not right action at any given time and place.

Our "beliefs" if they came to be generally accepted as truths could only have a revolutionary, and for a time at least disastrous, effect on modern concepts of what is "right." The present moral tradition has grown up during the last few thousand years from religious and

philosophical teachings, most of which have impressed on us the belief that whatever lies behind phenomena is, in some way or other, kindly disposed towards individual human beings. This belief we cannot accept. It fails to take into account the evil in the universe, and the eternal bloody struggle between organisms for survival. The belief that the God of creation is "all-loving" is an idea in the human mind which does not fit the facts. It is something entirely different in kind to what is "righteous" in the sight of God.

It should be obvious that God is not a democrat. When we see all the inequalities between man and man, varieties and varieties, and species and species, an inequality that is inherent in creation, and not brought about by human sinfulness, what grounds have we for believing that all men are equal? Yet religious teachers, the writers of the American Constitution, and the founders of all democratic institutions tell us that they are. Where then shall we find the truth of the matter! Should we accept the view of human idealists, or should we accept the stark facts of creation which tell us that all men are not equal, and were not intended to be?

It is argued by many modern thinkers that happiness is the only thing worth striving for; that there is nothing else that man can possibly want. They draw a distinction between the happiness of the individual as such, and the happiness of mankind as a whole; between the well-being of the "I" and that of the "We." They claim, quite rightly, that it is far nobler to promote the happiness of the many than to seek the satisfactions of the one. Their slogan is "the greatest good for the greatest number." There are very few people to-day, whether they have religious convictions or not, who disagree with them.

But to us the main purpose of creation is the physical, mental, and spiritual evolution of the human species and not the provision of happiness for either the one, or the many. We have to look on ourselves as something experimental which is gradually being moulded into something different. We are still under the surgeon's knife. We are the raw material out of which something greater is being evolved. Whether or not this evolutionary process makes us any happier now, or will do so in the future, is incidental to this main purpose. The evolution of the human species does not necessarily mean increased happiness. To us the first cause of all things is not a "personal" God. He is a God who is engaged on schemes of infinite magnitude; schemes which transcend the human aspirations of the present day. In the divine scheme of things there is something greater to work for than the providing of pleasurable sensations for the human family.

Although the design of the first cause is the evolution of species and not happiness, happiness comes to those who conform to this design, who adhere to the fundamental truths behind phenomena. Happiness is a contentment which comes from spiritual, mental, and physical harmony with the creative purpose, so that when we are out of tune with this purpose, we suffer. Pain, whatever form it takes, is a warning that something is wrong. When we suffer physically, or mentally, we are out of touch with Creation biologically; when our distress is due to those "pricks of conscience" which we get after failure to do the "right" we are out of touch with it spiritually. Complete happiness comes only to those who are both biologically and spiritually in tune with the first cause.

Our "belief" that the human species is something more than the sum of its parts is also alien to traditional thought. The individual has always been looked upon as something unique. This to a certain extent is true. No two individuals, for example, have the same finger prints. But the differences between individuals are slight when compared with their likenesses. No human being can diverge from the norm to such an extent that he can acquire the biological and spiritual characteristics of another species. However much individuals differ they are still members of the one human family. In details they are unique, in substance they are not.

Our belief that the design of creation is the evolution of the species, and not the saving of individual "souls" would certainly not be accepted by any religious body at the present time. But if we are to be guided by what both intuition and reason tell us, we see no alternative to this belief. The widespread conviction that the human being has a soul which can exist apart from the body is purely intuitive. Our belief on the other hand, as we have seen in the chapter on species, has both biological and "moral" evidence, as well as reason, to support it.

If there is no after life there can be no posthumous heaven or hell. Heaven and hell are figments of the human imagination. The belief in them has been fostered throughout history by both ecclesiastical and lay authorities, to supplement the limited rewards or punishments that could be bestowed or inflicted on individuals during their lifetime. They have been used by religious bodies to discipline their followers from time immemorial. It is very doubtful if the man in the street believes in heaven and hell now. If asked he would probably say (in spite of what his spiritual advisers tell him) that he

does not know. To picture one's near departed as living in a celestial paradise, or roasting in hell, is something the mind boggles at. Heaven and hell have no more basis in fact than the belief (now discarded even by those who claim to be infallible) that the earth was created in 4004 B.C.

In our search for guidance among the complexities of life we have come to realize that in a universe where everything else is changing the only thing that is constant is change itself. This change is not always upwards in the sense that it furthers human progress, and if our interpretation of what is the will of God is correct the only fixed rule we can possibly have is to guide this change in the direction which our combined sensory and extra-sensory faculties tell us the Creator intended it to go. As we believe, for reasons that we have already given, that the biological and spiritual uplift of the human species is the only "good," then devotion to this uplift is the guiding principle that we, the doubters, seek. It is our only "must," our one categorical imperative. It becomes, if we may call it such, our only religion.

To satisfy man's psychic needs many religions have been founded during the course of history. Some of them have exerted a profound, and in many ways a beneficial, influence on human behaviour for thousands of years. But it is inevitable that they must fail eventually. They are all founded on dogmatic assertions about the physical universe and the origin of Man which expanding human knowledge sooner or later proves to be wrong. Many of them have formulated codes of conduct which are good by any conceivable standard, but these codes have been so interwoven with alleged miraculous events, that the modern mind has a tendency to throw away the

good inherent in all the great religions with the false beliefs with which it is associated. It is for this reason that we believe that the only eternally satisfying religion possible is one devoted to change itself, to evolution in its widest sense, a religion which has its fundamental truths, but which can take scientific discoveries in its stride, and which is adaptable enough to change its codes of ethics to meet the needs of changing life.

Our quarrel with existing religions is not so much for what they do, as for what they leave undone. In their own way they help man in spiritual matters, but they take no account of his biological needs. They exhort him to follow the path of righteousness, not for its own sake, but in the hope of gaining rewards, or of avoiding punishments. To us it does seem a tragedy that they cannot, or will not, rid themselves of outdated metaphysics and concentrate on what both reason and revelation tells us is the design of the first cause, the evolution of Man. With their vast organizations they have a wonderful opportunity to further this end.

We realize how necessary it is, in the present stage of evolution, for religions to be conservative. It is fatal for them to alter any of their dogmas in an attempt to reconcile them with scientific discoveries. If they do so they lose their claim to divine infallibility.

Nevertheless religious dogmas should not be cast aside without good reason. Loss of faith in them can have disastrous effects for many years. When a civilization develops, and accumulates facts about the universe which cannot be reconciled with traditional beliefs, it loses its fear of supernatural sanctions and its hope for the hereafter. This, in the present stage of man's spiritual progress leads to an attitude to life in which the individual

loses his sense of responsibility. He seeks pleasure wherever he can find it, regardless of the ultimate consequences. When a civilization, however scientifically progressive it may be, loses its traditional beliefs it becomes morally lax, and degenerates both physically and spiritually. This was the fate of all the great civilizations of antiquity, and will be that of our own if we fail to find some "faith" to supersede our decaying Christianity.

The fall of a great civilization may seem tragic to us historically, but we should remember that it is all part of the evolutionary progress. Just as the individual has to die to make way for others higher in the evolutionary scale, so do civilizations. However high culturally a civilization may become, it is eventually superseded by another which has a stronger will to power, and whose "faiths" are more in accordance with the known facts of the universe. Just as the Christian civilization has supplanted the cult of the totem pole, so will it, in turn, be supplanted by a religious civilization based on an increased human knowledge which is both scientific and extra-sensory.

If we are to be true to ourselves we must not blind ourselves to the fact that the death and destruction of the old is as much a part of progress as the birth and building up of the new; whether the outworn be individuals, varieties, civilizations or religions. Death is the natural order of things for everything organic. It is inevitable, and as God wills, however much the instinct of self-preservation urges us to fight against it.

Let us face up to the facts of creation and not cower behind some metaphysic which has been devised for the sole purpose of reassuring mankind that the purpose of creation is not evolutionary progress but the granting

of that which frail man himself desires. We need not fear death. Although it is oblivion for us as individuals, biologically and spiritually we live on in posterity. When we die we shall have served the evolutionary purpose for which life was granted.

By studying the universe we have become aware of the many-sidedness of the one God; that He is something more than dehydrated spirit; that He is the embodiment of full-blooded, pulsating life in all its aspects; that He is both an ethereal God, and at the same time a fleshly one.

It follows that if man is to evolve into something greater than he is at present, that is, something more Godlike, then he will have to be something more than "spiritual." God's superman will not be ashamed of his body, or of any other of God's gifts. He will not be a man who turns the other cheek, but one who lives and fights both for his own survival and for his place in the sun. At the same time that part of his being, the soul, which governs his relationship to his fellow men, will be so developed that when the necessity does arise, he will never hesitate to sacrifice himself for the sake of his species, for evolution. He will be neither saint nor brute; he will follow the will of his Creator and become a sane combination of both. In doing so he will be a happy man.

When deciding whether or not to devote ourselves to evolution we have a free choice. If we do decide to help this cause we must not expect everlasting bliss; if we decide otherwise there will be no eternal damnation. The concepts of heaven and hell should not be allowed to influence us in any way when making a decision. They are mystical visions and not the creations of the Almighty.

The doing of one's duty to creation is its own reward.

We should realize that if evolutionary progress is to be made many of our existing moral precepts will need qualification. "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you" has undoubtedly helped human progress, but if we are to further the cause of man in both his biological and spiritual aspects we should not act on this precept without reservations. "Do unto others, etc." does not mean that we should give way to the needs and desires of others under all circumstances. This could only lead to the domination of one individual or group over others, and a degeneration of those qualities which further evolution. Rather it means a knightly, chivalrous attitude to one's fellow men, an attitude of mutual respect and toleration between equals.

Neither should we tolerate the desires, or even "rights" of others (even though they are the same as our own) if these desires or rights are inimical to human progress. If we do so, we shall be running counter to the will of the first cause.

In our survey of mankind we have of necessity had to pick out those aspects of life which we believe to be relevant to our main purpose. There are many human activities which affect evolution with which we cannot deal here; all of them will have to be judged in their ultimate effect on evolution. Economics, for example, plays a great part in everyday life. The struggle for a higher standard of living is no doubt a "good" up to a point, but after that it is liable to cause evolutionary regression. Few individuals can overcome the handicaps of either extreme poverty or luxurious wealth, and still develop their biological and spiritual characteristics to the full. What economic "mean" supplies the best results needs investigating.

We realize the extreme difficulty of altering one's outlook on life from a Christian, or even from a materialistic point of view, and substituting an evolutionary one. But in spite of this, and of all the prejudices it will encounter, we hope to see in the future a movement or religion which is entirely devoted to the biological and spiritual evolution of the human species; in which all human activities are diverted from unrealistic ideals and directed towards helping in creation's greatest work. Our physical and mental abilities, together with freewill and the power to receive revelation, were given us, not to be used in singing fulsome praises of the Almighty, but to help Him in His great work of creation. This help we shall have to give without sordid considerations of reward or punishment. By doing so we shall achieve a greater good and a higher morality than anything that has gone before. We shall have taken another evolutionary step nearer to God.

लाल बहादुर शास्त्री राष्ट्रीय प्रशासन अकादमी, पुस्तकालय
L.B.S. National Academy of Administration, Library

मस्ती

MUSSOORIE

101002

यह पुस्तक निम्नांकित तारीख तक वापिस करनी है।

This book is to be returned on the date last stamped

GL 215.25

—
LAM



215.25

Lam

अवाप्ति सं०

ACC. No. ~~1515~~.....

वर्ग सं.

पुस्तक सं. 101002

Class No. Book No.

लेखक

Author. Lambley, J.

शीर्षक

Title. Religion in a space age.

निर्गम दिनांक Date of Issue	उधारकर्ता की सं. Borrower's No.	हस्ताक्षर Signature
.....
.....

215.25

~~1515~~

Lam

LIBRARY

LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI

National Academy of Administration
MUSSOORIE

Accession No. 101002

1. Books are issued for 15 days only but may have to be recalled earlier if urgently required.
2. An over-due charge of 25 Paise per day per volume will be charged.
3. Books may be renewed on request, at the discretion of the Librarian.
4. Periodicals, Rare and Reference books may not be issued and may be consulted only in the Library.
5. Books lost, defaced or injured in any way shall have to be replaced or its double